DIOCESAN CHURCHES

NOT

Yet Discovered in the Primitive Times.

OR

A Defence of the Answer to Dr. *Stillingfleets* Allegations out of Antiquity for such Churches.

Against the Exceptions offered in the Preface to a late Treatise called a Vindication of the Primitive Church.

by David Clarkson

WHERE

What is further produced out of Scripture and Antient Authors for Diocesan Churches is also Discussed.

LONDON,

Printed for *Thomas Parkhurst* at the Bible and three Crowns at the lower end of *Cheap-side* near *Mercers Chappel* 1682.

Errata.

PAge 59. l. 4. r. Sirmond. p. 67. l. 33. r. to. p. 76. r. Euodius. p. 80. l. 14. r. oratorum. p. 86. l. 16. r. Congregations. p. 87. l. 27. r. Bishops. p. 95. l. 2. r. διανίπωσις, p. ult. l. 9. r. less. besides mis-accenting some Greek words, and other mis-pointings.

THE PREFACE.

DIſſenters *are accuſed of* Schiſm *by ſome of this Church, both theſe and the other are branded not only as* Schiſmaticks, *but as* Hereticks *by the* Papiſts; *who upon this account judge us unworthy to live, and had actually deſtroyed* both *together, if* God *in Mercy had not diſcover'd their deviliſh* Plot. *The diſcovery gave them ſome interruption, and put them upon an after-game, to retrieve what had miſcarryed. And this was ſo to* divide *us, as that* our ſelves *ſhould help them in their deſign to* ruine us all, *when they had leſs hopes to do it* alone. *In purſuance hereof ſuch influence they have had upon too many, as to raiſe in them a greater averſation to* Diſſenters *than to* Papiſts. *Theſe the* Conſpirators *count their own, and think they may well do ſo, ſince*

they are too ready to concurre with them in their deſign to exterminate thoſe, who are true Proteſtants in every point, *and differ no more from this* Church *than thoſe in* France *do, who by the ſame Counſels are at this time in extreme danger to be utterly extirpated. Others are ſo far prevailed with as to make uſe of one of the ſharpeſt weapons they have againſt diſſenting Proteſtants, and that is the charge of* Schiſme, *lately renewed and re-inforced.*

In theſe hard circumſtances, while we do what we can againſt the common Enemy, *we are put to ward off the blows of ſuch as (notwithſtanding ſome preſent diſtemper) we will count our* Friends. *Amongſt other expedients, ſufficient to ſecure us againſt this attaque, it was thought not unuſeful, to anſwer the* allegations out of Antiquity, *concerning two points, wherein only the* Antients *were made uſe of to our prejudice, viz.* 1. *For* Dioceſan Churches, *and then* 2*ly. Againſt* the Election of Biſhops by the people *in the primitive times. Something was performed and publiſhed in reference to both theſe in a late diſcourſe. One half*

of

of which, where the latter is discussed, concerning the popular Elections of Bishops, *hath yet passed without any exception that I can see or hear of; yet this alone is enough to defend us against the aforesaid charge: For those who will not make the* primitive *Church* Schismatical, *must not condemn any as* Schismaticks *for declining such* Bishops *as that Church would not own.*

Against the former part of the Discourse, concerning Diocesan Churches, *some exception hath been made, but very little; a late* Author *in his* Preface *to a Treatise of another Subject, hath touched about* 5 *pages in* 40. *but so as he hath done them no more harm, than another, who to find one fault therein, runs himself into two or three, about* [illegible], *render'd* indefinitely *according to the mind of the* Author *who uses it, and the most common use of it.*

I disparage not the Gentleman's *Learning who attaques me in his Preface, he shews that which, (with answerable care and judgment,) might be serviceable in a cause that deserves it. But much more than he shews, would not be enough to support what he would establish. And he might have forborn the vi-*

vilifying of those, who are known to be Masters *of much more valueable Learning, than appears in either of us. The neglect of some accurateness in little things, remote from the merits of the cause, in one who is not at leisure to* catch flies, *is no argument that he is destitute of Learning.*

I complain not of his proceeding with me; but am obliged by him, that he treats me not with so much contempt as he does others, who less deserve it. I wish he had dealt more temperately with M. B. it would have been more for his reputation, and no prejudice to his undertaking; a good *cause, when it hath a* sufficient *Advocate, does not need any indecent supplements.*

After I have cleared my Discourse from this Gentleman's *exceptions, I thought it not impertinent to shew what in reason cannot be counted competent proofs of* Diocesan Churches, *that if any will pursue this debate farther, instead of opposing us, they may not* beat the Air, *and amuse those that enquire after truth, with what is insignificant. What I have given an account of what other allegations out of Scripture and Antiquity this Author*

hath

hath brought in other parts of his Treatiſe for ſuch Churches; and ſhew'd that there is no evidence in them, as to the purpoſe they are alledged for.

In ſhort, I find nothing in this Author, *or any other before him, which may ſatisfie a judicious and impartial man, that in the* two firſt Ages *of Chriſtianity any Biſhop had more than one particular Church or Congregation for his proper charge; or that in* the third Age, *there was any Biſhop which had a Church conſiſting of more than are in ſome one of our* Pariſhes, *unleſs it was the Church of* Rome *(nor is there ſufficient evidence produced for that:) Or that in* the middle of the fourth Age *there were 4 Churches, each of which compriſed more than could aſſemble in one place (though if they had contained more, that might be far enough from making them Dioceſans;) Or that afterwards, within the* time of the four firſt General Councils, *where there were ſeveral Churches belonging to one Biſhop, he did exerciſe jurisdiction over them alone, or only by himſelf and his Delegates. It will be time enough to cenſure us as* Schiſmaticks *for declining* Dioceſan Churches, *when they have made it appear,*

pear, that there was such, in the best ages of Christianity: (which not appearing, the censure falls upon the primitive Christians, from whom it will slide of upon themselves.) If they will forbear us, till this be performed, we need desire no more. Unless we may prevail with those who sincerely profess themselves Protestants, to regard the securing themselves and their Religion from the destructive designs of the Papists, more than those things which are not properly the concern either of Protestant or of Religion.

As for those who prefer the Papists before Dissenters, and revile these as worse, though they differ in no one point of Religion from other true Protestants: We need not wonder if we meet with no better treatment from them, then from declared Papists; since by such preference they too plainly declare the Protestant Religion to be worse than Popery, in their account. The following sheets have lain by me many Months, and had done so still; but that the importunity of some, and the misrepresenting of my silence by others, forced me to publish them.

Dioceſan Churches not yet diſcovered in the Primitive times.

TO ſhew that many Presbyters in one Church was not enough to prove it a *Dioceſan*, I I made it manifeſt that it was uſual in the antient Church, to multiply Presbyters, *beyond what we count neceſſary*; (not beyond what is neceſſary, as it is too often miſrepreſented:) For this I offer'd two Teſtimonies, one aſſerting it to be ſo in the *Firſt Age*, the other in the *Fourth*, and thought theſe ſufficient, if they could not be denied, (as they are not) to evince it to have been ſo in the *Third*: For who can reaſonably ſuppoſe, but that had place in the *Third*, which was uſual both in the Ages *before* and *after*? The firſt was that of *Biſhop Downham*, who ſayes, *at the firſt Converſion of Cities, the number of people converted were not much greater than the number of Presbyters placed amongſt them.* But *this*, its ſayed *can be of little uſe*; 'becauſe, 1. This 'was not the caſe of the Church of *Carthage*, it was 'not a new converted Church, but ſetled long before, 'and in a flouriſhing condition.

The Church of *Carthage* by the fierce perſecutions in *Cyprians* time (which is the time we ſpeak of) was brought ſo low, and reduced to ſo very few, as if it had been but new converted, and how was it *in a ſetled and flouriſhing condition*, when it was ſo lamentably waſted, and ſtill harraſſed one year after another? or who can be-

lieve it, that reads *Cyprian* lamenting; *Preſſuræ iſtius tam turbidam vaſtitatem, quæ gregem noſtrum maxima ex parte populata eſt, adhuc & uſque populatur*, and that they were *poſiti inter plangentium ruinas, et timentium reliquias, inter numeroſam & languentium ſtragem, et exiguam ſtantium paucitatem?* (a) Was not this much the caſe of the *Apoſtolical Churches*, unleſs this of *Carthage* was worſe, and ſo leſs for our Author's advantage? Or if this were otherwiſe, the Churches in *Nazianzen's* time were not *newly converted*, but *ſetled* long before, and in a *flouriſhing condition*; which yet cannot be denyed to have had more Presbyters than *we count needful*. So that this was the practiſe in every condition of the Church, whether flouriſhing or not.

(a) *Lib.* 4. *Ep.* 4.

2. 'He ſayes, many more Presbyters may be ordain-'ed in a City, than is neceſſary for the firſt beginning of 'a Church, with reſpect to future increaſe. *&c.*

And who will queſtion, but the many Presbyters in the Church of *Carthage* were for *future increaſe* both in City and Country? So that herein the caſe is not different; And the deſign of that number of Officers might partly be for other Congregations, (Epiſcopal Churches, though not Dioceſan) to furniſh them with Officers. This is apparent afterwards in the practice of the *African Churches*, who when a new Church was erected, ſupplyed it with a Biſhop or other Aſſiſtants from places better ſtored with Officers; And it is exemplyfied particularly (as we ſhall ſee hereafter) in the proviſion which St. *Auſtin* made for *Fuſſala*.

'He ſayes further, the multitude of Presbyters belong-'ing to one Congregational Church, might be occaſi-'on'd by the uncertain abode of moſt of the *Apoſtles* 'and their *Commiſſioners*, who are the Principal, if not 'the only Ordainers of Presbyters mentioned in Scrip-'ture.

But

But herein he does but gueſs, and had no reaſon to be poſitive, unleſs the *Apoſtles* and their *Commiſſioners*, (as he calls them,) had been then the only Ordainers, which he will not venture to affirm, knowing what evidence there is againſt it.

'Laſtly, he ſayes, if this opinion of *Biſhop Downham* 'had any certain ground in Antiquity, we ſhould pro-'bably hear of it with both eares, and we ſhould have 'it recommended upon antienter Authority than his.

This of *Biſhop Downham* hath certain ground in the beſt antiquity, if the *New Teſtament* be ſuch; where it is plain there were many Presbyters in diverſe Churches, ſuch as are not yet, nor ever will be proved to be *Dioceſan*.

To that of *Nazianzen*; he ſayes, 'it hath received 'its anſwer, and adds, he that cannot anſwer it to him-'ſelf, from the great difference between the condition of 'the Church in *Cyprian*, and in *Nazianzen*'s time, hath 'a fondneſs for the Argument.

This is the anſwer it received, *Pag.* 51. and this difference was thus expreſſed a little before; 'But that any 'Church fixt and ſetled, having its Biſhop alwayes pre-'ſent, ſhould multiply Presbyters *beyond neceſſity*, in the 'circumſtances of the Primitive Chriſtians before *Con-'ſtantine*, is altogether incredible; for the neceſſary ex-'pences of the Church were very great, the poor nu-'merous, the generality of Chriſtians not of the Rich-'eſt, and the Eſtates they had being at the diſcretion of 'their enemies, and ruin'd with perpetual perſecution, *&c.* He ſayes, multiplying Presbyters *beyond neceſſity*, and *without neceſſity*; while he alters my words ſo as to change the ſenſe, he diſputes againſt himſelf, not me; But this looking more like an Argument than any thing before, I ſhall take a little more notice of it. 1. Is not all this applicable to the Churches in the *Apoſtle*'s times,

when it cannot be denyed *Presbyters* were multiplyed beyond what we count neceſſary ? *The poor numerous, the generality of Chriſtians not of the Richeſt,* and *the Eſtates they had being at the diſcretion of their enemies, and ruin'd with perpetual perſecution.*

Further, the Church before *Conſtantine* and *Carthage* particularly, ſuppoſing theſe to be its circumſtances, might have many Presbyters without any great charge: For 1ſt. the Church Stock was reſerved *only* for thoſe in *want*, τοῖς δεομένοις, as is determin'd in one of the *Canons* which paſs for *Apoſtolical*, (b) and the ſame decreed in the ſynod at *Antioch*. (c) *Ambroſe* even in the 4*th. Age*, will have none to have a ſtipend who hath other revennes, *Qui fidei exercet militiam, agelli ſui fructibus, ſi habet, debet eſſe contentus ; ſi non habet, ſtipendiorum ſuorum fructu.* (d) And *Chryſoſtom* tells us that in Elections, thoſe of the Competitors that had Eſtates did carry it, becauſe the Church would need to be at no charge in maintaining of ſuch, ἵνα μὴ δέοιτο τρέφεσθαι ἐκ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας προσόδων. 2ly. When they had no Eſtates, and the *Church* could not maintain them, they were to provide for themſelves by ſome honeſt imployment. The Council of *Elvira* allows all ſorts of Clergy men to drive a trade, for their living, provided they did it only in the Province where they lived, (f) and in the 4th. Council of *Carthage* it is ordered, that the Clergy, *though they be learned in the word of God, ſhall get their living by a trade.* (g) and in the next *Canon* that *they ſhall get food and rayment by a Trade or Husbandry*, with this proviſo, *that it be not a prejudice to their Office.* Our *Author* ſayes indeed, (h) *that this is contrary to the uſage of all other Churches* ; how true this is may be ſeen by the *Canon* before cited. He ſayes alſo, *that this is forbidden by the* 3*d. Council of Carthage* ; but neither is this ſo, that *Canon* adds but another reſtriction, *viz.* that *they get not their livings by*

(b) *Can.* 4.
(c) *Can.* 25.
(d) *Offic. L.* 1. *c.* 36.
(e) *De ſacerd. Orat.* 3. *Pag.* 23. *Edit. Savil.*
(f) *Can.* 19.
(g) *Can.* 51.
(h) *Pag.* 154.

by an employment that is ſordid or diſhoneſt, where the Latine and Greek both agree in it. 3ly. The Church was to allow none of them, no not *Biſhops* more than *neceſſary*, even after *Conſtantine*'s time. That Canon call'd the *Apoſtles*, and the other *Antioch* forecited, expreſs this in the ſame words, *the Biſhop may have of the Church Stock what is neeedfull, if he be neceſſitous*, τὰ δέοντα εἰ δεῖτο πρὸς ἀναγκαίας χρείας, for *neceſſary uſes*, and theſe are afterwards explain'd *to be food and rayment*. *Zonaras* expreſſes it fully and clearly, whom he that the *Canon* doth not ſatisfie, may conſult. (i) *can.* 15. *in Cod.* 16.

Having ſhew'd out of *Juſtinian*, that 60 Presbyters belonged to the great Church in *Conſtantinople*, and thence inferr'd they were numerous in *Conſtantine*'s time, the 'number (ſayes he,) was become extravagant in *Ju*-'*ſtinians* time; but what is this to their number in *Cy*-'*prian's*?

He ſhould have asked the *Dean* this, who to prove *Dioceſan* Churches from the number of Presbyters, immediately after Teſtimonies out of *Cyprian*, brings this of *Juſtinian*.

'For this very edict of *Juſtinian* ſhews that this multi-'plying of Church Officers was an innovation, and *there*-'*fore* would have them reduced to the firſt eſtabliſhment.

Juſtinian took order to retrench the numbers of Presbyters, not *therefore* becauſe it was an *innovation*, but becauſe the Church revenue could not maintain ſo many, which is expreſs in the *Novel*.

'But that firſt eſtabliſhment it ſeems admitted great 'numbers, for one Church had 60. *True*; but it muſt alſo 'be noted firſt, that theſe 60 were to ſerve more than 'one Church.

Some may be ready to ask how it can be *true*, that one Church ſhould have 60, and yet more than one had theſe 60 amongſt them. 'For

'For there were three more beſides St. *Sophia* to be 'ſupplyed by theſe Presbyters. *&c.*

True; but this ſtill confirms what I anſwer'd to their argument from the multitude of Presbyters, that in the antient Church the Officers were multiplyed *above what we count needful:* For it is not now thought needful that any 3 or 4 Churches in a City, ſhould have 60 Presbyters, 100 Deacons, 90 Subdeacons, Readers 110. *&c.*

'Yet after all, there is no argument to be drawn from 'this number, for theſe were *Canons* of a particular foun-'dation, deſign'd for the ſervice of a *Collegiate* Church; 'and no meaſure to be taken from thence concerning the 'numbers of Presbyters belonging to the Dioceſs. This 'is evident from the Preface of the ſaid *Novel.*

If no argument is to be drawn from this number, why did the *Learned Dean* draw one from it? 2ly. This ſeems ſcarce conſiſtent with the former Period: there, theſe Presbyters were for 3 *or* 4 *Churches*, here they are but for *one Collegiate* Church of which they were *Canons*, and this ſaid to be evident in the *Preface*, where I cannot ſee it. 3ly. *Since no meaſure is to be taken from hence concerning the numbers of Presbyters belonging to a Dioceſs*; it ſeems there may be this number of Presbyters in a place which cannot be counted a *Dioceſs*, (as this one great Church never was, nor can be) and then no argument drawn from the number of Presbyters at *Rome*, *Carthage*, *Edeſſa*, *&c.* will prove a *Dioceſan Church*; for here was the greateſt number, which any where we meet with.

Dr. St. to prove *Dioceſan* Churches from the numerouſneſs of Presbyters, mentioned 60 in C. P. in *Juſtinian's* time; from hence on the by, I thought it reaſonable to ſuppoſe they were numerous in *Conſtantine's* time, when yet *Theodoret* ſayes, *all the Brethren met together with the Biſhop.* That the number of Presbyters is no

Proof

proof of a *Dioceſan* Church was evinced ſufficiently before: this fell in occaſionally, and was added *ex abundanti*; Yet upon this ſupernumerary ſtragler he turns his main force, ſpending about 12 Pages on it. I am little concerned what becomes of it, ſince the main Hypotheſis is already ſecured by the premiſſes; but that this Gentleman may not quite looſe all his labour, I am willing to looſe a little, in taking ſome notice of it.

'I muſt confeſs that what is added concerning the 'Church of C. P. is ſomewhat ſurprizing, no doubt 'ſayes he, that the Presbyters were *more numerous* in 'C. P.

Indeed it might have been ſurprizing if I had ſaid as he reports me, that they were *more numerous*; but I ſaw reaſon not to ſay ſo, though what reaſon there was to impoſe it on me I know not: I cited *Soc*: miſprinted *Soz.* ſaying, *Conſtantine built two Churches at C. P.*, but laid no ſtreſs on it at all. (k) *It is true*, he ſayes *not that he built no more than two*, but his expreſſion plainly implyes it, and he was concerned if he had known any more to have mention'd it, when in the ſame Line, he ſayes *Conſtantine* intended to make it equal to *Rome*. *Euſebius*'s words agree well enough herewith, he ſayes *Conſtantine adorn'd it*, πλείοσιν, *with more Churches*, and that's true, if he built but *two* more, or any more than was there formerly, or any more than was uſual. And theſe *more* Churches were not in the City, but (as the *Hiſtorian* ſpeaks) partly there, and partly περὶ τὴν ἄστυ, which as the word is uſed, may denote places many Miles diſtant from the City, as the *Gentleman* elſewhere obſerves after *Valeſius*. *Sozomen* ſayes he built πλείους, many Churches, (not very many as he will have it) but if he thereby meant more than are named by *Socrates*, we need not underſtand that done before the time *Theodoret* ſpeaks of; Nor ſhould a lax expreſſion be more relyed on,

(k) *Soc. l. 1. c. 12.*

on, than one that is punctual and definite; unleſs we have a mind either to be miſled, or to ſet the two *Hiſtorians* together by the ears. *Sozomen* names but one Church more than *Socrates* did, and that not *in*, but a good diſtance from the City, (70 Furlongs by Land,) and 3 may paſs for *many*, when it was a rare thing for any City to have *more than one*. The beſt Authors, as they ſometimes expreſs *very few* by *none*, and a *generality* by *all*; ſo they expreſs *more than ordinary* by *many*; and *two* or *three ſuch* Churches in one City were more than ordinary at that time, when one City in an Hundred had not *two* Churches, and one in a Thouſand had not *three* Churches, that could be ſtyled μέγιστοι: *all* that *Conſtantine* built here were *ſuch*, both *Euſebius* his *more*, and *Sozomen's many*, are ſaid, by them to be very great, μέγιστοι. But no conſiderable Author that I meet with in that Age, or ſome Hundreds of years after, names more than two *very great Churches* erected by *Conſtantine* in that City. And if compariſon be made, there is no *Hiſtorian* of thoſe times, to be more regarded in matters which concern *C. P.*, than *Socrates* who tells us, that he was born and educated in *C. P.*, and continued there (as an advocate) when he wrote his Hiſtory.

L. 9. C. 24.

But if we ſhould ſuppoſe that *Sozomen* intended more than 3 or 4 Churches, or that the *Emperour* built no more than was requiſite, and only conſulted conveniency, and deſign'd not State or Magnificence, (which yet our Author a little after ſayes he did; and we know nothing is more ordinary than for great Cities to have more Churches than are needful: it was ſo in *London* before the Fire, and the retrenching of their number ſince ſhews it:) yet this will be ſo far from proving *Alexander's* Church in *C. P.* to be *Dioceſan*, that it will not prove it greater than ſome ſingle Congregations: for there were 12 Churches in *Alexandria*, when yet the Church

in

in that City adhereing to *Athanasius* consisted of no more than are in some one of our Parishes. For which such Evidence has been brought, as is not yet, nor I think, can be defaced. 'Nor can we imagine that two 'Churches, much less one, could suffice all the Christi-'ans in *C. P.* when the City of *Heliopolis* being convert-'ed to Christianity required more, and *Constantine* 'built several for them, ἐκκλησίας ϑ κτίσας.

The word *plurally* expressed is much improved by our *Author*, he makes out of it *diverse Churches*, and *all these Churches*, when yet *all these* were but *one* Church, as *Socrates* himself makes it plain a little before *l*; for having related how *Constantine* ordered a Church to be built near the *Oak* at *Mambre*, he adds, that he ordered *another Church* (not Churches) *to be erected at* Heliopolis, ἑτέραν ἐκκλησίαν κατασκευασθῆναι. And to put it past doubt, *Eusebius* whom the *Emperour* employ'd about those structures, and from whom in all likelihood *Socrates* had the Relation, gives an account but of *one Church* there founded by the *Emperour*, which he calls οἶκον εὐκτήριον ἐκκλησίας m, and that it was furnished with a *Bishop*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. So that the Bishop of *Heliopolis* had but one Church for his Dioceſs, which our *Author* should not be so loath to own, since it cannot be proved that at this time one Bishop in an hundred, had more.

l Soc. l. 1. c. 18.

m l. 3. c. 56. De vitâ Constant.

Valesius (whom our *Author* much relies on) in his *Notes* upon this place, is so far from thinking that *Constantine* built more Churches in *Heliopolis*, that he judges this one at present was not necessary for it, the Town having then no Christians in it: and assigns this as the reason why *Eusebius* speaks of it as a thing unusual, that it should have a Bishop appointed, and a Church built in it. His words are, *Fortasse hoc novum & inauditum fuisse intelligit*, &c. *He may think this new and unheard*

of, that a Church ſhould be built in a City, where as yet there were no Chriſtians but all were alike idolaters. Therefore this Church was built at Heliopolis, *not for that there was any neceſſity of it, but rather in hope that he might invite all the Citizens to the profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion.* So that the Biſhop here had none for his Dioceſe but one Church, and that empty, there being then no Chriſtians in that one Pariſh; which yet was all he had to make him a *Dioceſan.*

in lib. 3. de vit. Conſtant. c. 58. p. 235.

The better to confute *Theodoret*, who ſaies (for they are his words, not mine) that *Alexander with all the Brethren met together*, he endeavours to ſhew the ſtate of that Church about the latter end of *Conſtantine*, &c. this he does here and after by an undue Application of ſome paſſages in *Sozomen.* For the account which that *Hiſtorian* gives of that City is not confined to *Conſtantine's* time, but reaches beyond it, ay, and beyond *Julian's* too, which appears, as by other paſſages, ſo by his mentioning the *heathen Temples* in the time of that Emperour. And with reſpect to the time after *Conſtantine* muſt that expreſſion be underſtood, which makes *C. P. to exceed* Rome, *not only in Riches, but in the number of Inhabitants*, otherwiſe it will be apparently falſe. For when *Chryſoſtome* was Biſhop there, about 70 years after (when it is like the number of the Inhabitants were doubled, it cannot be queſtioned but they were far more numerous) he who beſt could do it, reckons the Chriſtians then to be an 100000 *n*; our *Author* will have us look upon the *Jews* and *Heathen* there to be inconſiderable but let us count them another 100000. Yet both put together will fall incomparably ſhort of the number in old *Rome*, which by the computation of *Lipſius* was at leaſt *two millions o.* And in *Conſtantine's* time *new Rome* was as far ſhort of the old

n *In Act. Hom. 11. pag. 674.*

o *De Magnit. Rom. lib. 3. c. 3.*

as

as to its greatneſs in circuit, for whereas *Herodian* declares that *Severus* quite demoliſhed *Byzantium* for ſiding with *Niger*, and reducing it to the *State of a Village ſubjected it to* Perinthus, κώμη δουλεύειν Περινθίοις δῶρον ἐδόθη *p*, we cannot in reaſon ſuppoſe it to be extraordinarily ſpacious; yet as *Zoſimus* reports, all the inlargement which *Conſtantine* gave it, was but the addition of 15 Furlongs, σταδίοις πεντεκαίδεκα *q*. Now ſuppoſe it was 30 or 40 Furlongs in compaſs before (and ſo larger than one City in an hundred) yet this addition will leave it leſs than *Alexandria*, which, as *Joſephus* deſcribes it, was 80 Furlongs, that is, ten miles in circumference *r*, yet *Alexandria* was four times leſs than *Rome*, for by *Vopiſcus*'s account, in *Aurelian*'s time, not long before *Conſtantine*, *the walls were made* by him *near* 50 *miles in circuit*. So it will be in compariſon of *Conſtantinople* when firſt built, rather like a *Nation* than a *City*, as *Ariſtotle* ſaid of the other *Babylon*, ἔχει περιγραφὴν μᾶλλον ἔθνους, ἢ πόλεως *s*. If then we will have this paſſage of *Sozomen* to have any appearance of truth, it muſt be extended far beyond *Conſtantine*'s time, when, as *Zoſimus* tells us, many of the ſucceeding Emperours were ſtill drawing multitudes of People to that City, ſo that it was afterwards encompaſſed with walls far larger, πολλῷ μείζοσιν, than thoſe of *Conſtantine* *t*. And in an Oration of *Themiſtius*, it is made a queſtion whether *Theodoſius junior* did not add more to *C. P.* than *Conſtantine* did to *Byzantium*.

p *lib.* 3. *p.* 68.

q *lib.* 2. *p.* 62.

r *De Bello Jud. lib.* 2. *cap.* 16.

s *Pol. lib.* 3. *c.* 2.

t *lib.* 2. *p.* 63.

'Many of the *Jews* and almoſt all the Heathen were 'converted and became Chriſtians.

The expreſſion of *Sozomen* does not hinder but as the main body of the *Jews* remained, ſo the numbers of the Heathen might be conſiderable. *Tertullian* ſpeaks of Citizens in his time as if they were *almoſt all Chriſtians*,

u *Apol. c.* 37. *penè omnes cives chriſtiani u*; yet no inſtance can be given of any one City where the Chriſtians were the major part of the Inhabitants: thoſe that take his words in a ſtrict ſenſe are very injurious to him, and make him ſpeak that which no antient Records will warrant. *Sozomen* alſo may ſuffer by ſtraining his expreſſion; but I will not digreſs to take further notice of what is not material; for I deſign not, nor have any need, to make any advantage of the numbers of the Heathens in this City.

He tells us of 950 Work-houſes whoſe rents were allowed to defray the Funeral expences of all that died in the City (for ſo it is expreſſed in the Conſtitution, w *Novel.* 43. περὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁσίαν τὸ πρᾶγμα ποιεῖσθαι w) theſe being performed with great ſolemnity, and multitudes of Attendants maintained by thoſe rents for that purpoſe x. How this here makes the Chriſtians in *C. P.* to be ſo very numerous as he would have them, he ſhould have ſhewed us; I am not yet ſo ſagacious, as to diſcover it. The number of the Decani was determined by *Honorius* to 950 y. Our Author thinks it probable they were ſo many at the firſt eſtabliſhment, but there's more ground to believe, they were much fewer in *Conſtantine*'s time; for about 800 were counted ſufficient in *Juſtinian*'s Reign, 200 years after, when the City was both larger, and much more populous and in its greateſt flouriſh z. Thoſe that conſider the premiſſes, may well think, he might have form'd his concluſion in terms leſs confident, to ſay no worſe of it.

x *Nov.* 59. *c.* 2.

y *Cod. de Eccl. Lex.* 4:

z *Novil.* 59. *c.* 2.

Next he forms an Objection againſt himſelf: 'notwithſtanding the number of Chriſtians in *C. P.* might 'be much too great for one Congregation, yet the ma'jor part might be *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks*, ſuch as 'came not to the Biſhop's Church, and therefore all that

'that adhered to him might be no more than could 'meet in one Assembly.

To which he answers, *that the number of Hereticks and Schismaticks was inconsiderable*, and will not except the *Arians* or *Novatians*. For the *Arians*, he saies, *they had not yet made a formal Separation.*

But if they did not separate themselves, the Church would have them separated, and did exclude them from communion, and withstood *Constantine*'s importunity for their admission, both here and in other places: *Athanasius* was threatned by *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia a*, and banished by the *Emperour* for this cause among others. And *Alexander* being secured by *Arius* his death from admitting him to Communion, was the occasion of this passage in *Theodoret* which gives our *Author* so much trouble. Now the *Arians* being debarred from communion, lessened the Bishop's Church, both here and elsewhere, as much as if they had separated themselves. And they were numerous here, this being the place where they had greatest favour; in *Constantine*'s Edict against the *Hereticks* whose meetings he would have suppressed, the *Arians* were not mentioned when the other are named *b*. *Socrates* writes that the People in this City was divided into two Parties the *Arians* and the Orthodox, *they had continually sharp bickerings*, but while *Alexander* lived the Orthodox had the better; as soon as he was dead (which was * while *Constantine* lived) it seems they appeared equal, for *the contest*, saies he, *was dubious*, ἀμφίδοξος ἡ μάχη *c*. In *Nazianzen*'s time so far they overtopt the Orthodox, that this great *Dioceſan* Church appear'd but in the form of a *private meeting*, *held in a very little house*, where he kept a Conventicle with them, ἐν οἰκίσκῳ μικρῷ ἐκκλησιάζων; so *Sozomen d*, and *Socrates* agrees with him in the expression, ἐν μικρῷ οἰκίσκῳ, such a diminutive place seems as un-

a Soc. lib. 2. c. 19.

b Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 3. cap. 62. 63.

* Vales observ. in Soc. & Soz. l. 2.

c Soc. lib. 2. c. 6.

d Lib. 7. cap. 5.

unproportionable for such a *Diocesan* Church as a *Nutshell* for *Homer's Iliads*, or *a Key-hole for a Witch*, to use our Author's Elegancies.

As for the *Novatians* to which he will have no more allowed than a *Conventicle*, they were numerous in other places, they had once diverse Churches in *Alexandria*, many Churches in *Rome* and in other places. It is like they were numerous here, for here they had as much favour or more, and longer too, than in the Cities forementioned, here *Socrates* sayes *they had three* e *Lib.2.cap.30.* *Churches* e, and if three Churches would but make one *inconsiderable Conventicle*; it is possible the other Orthodox Churches (though he will have them to be many) might be comprized in *one vast Congregation.*

I might observe how much *Sozomen* is mis-represented in what he sayes next of those concerned in the *Edict*, the *Novatians* especially. He speaks not *mincingly* as our Author would have him, but fully that the *Novatians did not suffer much* by the Edict; he does not say *only that it was probable* they suffered little, but sayes this only of a reason himself gives, why they suffered not much. He gives other reasons for it than *the opinion*, *the* Novatians had of that Bishop. He does not say the *other Hereticks were altogether extirpated.* He does not confess that *the* Novatians *suffered the same measure with others every where*, no, nor any where else, it is the *Montanists* that he sayes this of. He *dares to affirm they had a Conventicle* or more, for he affirms they had an eminent Bishop in *C. P.* and were not only *numerous there before* the Edict, but *continued so after.* The *Gentleman* was in too much haste here, as himself will perceive, by observing how much his account differs from the *Historians.*

At last he comes to that passage of *Theodoret* which occasioned all these lines, *but* Theodoret *affirms they were*

were no more than could meet in one Church, and that they did actually do so, 'I answer, sayes he, that *Theodoret* 'does not say so, and the passage cited does not con-'clude it.

I did not say *Theodoret affirms they were no more, than could meet in one Church,* but he sayes the same in effect, viz. that *all the Brethren assembled with* Alexander. His words are, *Alexander, the Church rejoycing, held an Assembly with all the Brethren, praying and greatly glorifying God.* The words are plain, and the sense, I take them in, is open in the face of them. Nor do I believe that any disinterested person would put any other sense upon them than this, that *the generality of Christians of which the Church at* Constantinople *consisted, assembled together with their Bishop* Alexander, *to praise God joyfully for their deliverance by the death of* Arius. But he will not have the words *taken in a general sense,* but *will suppose them taken with respect to that particular Congregation, in which* Arius *was to be reconciled.* Yet this supposition hath no ground either in the words, or in the contexture of the Discourse, or any where else that I know of, or our *Author* either; for if he had, we should have heard it *with both ears,* as he speaks elsewhere. He will not have *all the Brethren, to be all the Believers at* C. P. yet he knows that *Brethren* and *Believers* are Synonymous terms both in *Scripture* and *ancient Authors.* And those were the Believers or Brethren of the Church of *C. P.* which had occasion to rejoyce, and that was the whole Church there: as for πάντας, render'd *Universi,* I do not take it *for all and every one* of the Christians there; for in all Assemblies, of great Churches especially, *many* are alwayes absent. He had dealt more fairly with *Theodoret,* if by *all* he would have understood the *generality of Christians adhereing to* Alexander *at* C. P. or the greatest part of them, and about

about ſuch an abatement of the full import of the word, there had been no need to contend; but his reſtraint of it to a particular Congregation agrees not with the words, nor the occaſion of them, nor hath any ſupport elſewhere.

Nor is that better which follows, *unleſs you will ſay that with all the Brethren, does not ſignifie their perſonal preſence, but only their unanimity.*

This looks more like a ſhift than a plain anſwer, and therefore he was well adviſed in not venturing to own it.

'*Theodoret* could not think that all the Beleivers of C. 'P. could come together to the Biſhop's Church, for he 'cites a Letter of *Conſtantine*'s a little after, where he 'gives an account of the great increaſe of that Church. *In the City that is call'd by my name by the Providence of God, an infinite multitude of People have joined themſelves to the Church, and all things there wonderfully increaſing, it ſeems very requiſite that more Churches ſhould be built; underſtanding therefore hereby what I have reſolved to do, I though fit to order you to provide* 50 *Bibles fairly and legibly written.*

He does not ſay an *infinite multitude*, the words of the Letter are μέγιστον πλῆθος, that there was a *very great multitude of Chriſtians* is not denied, nor that he intended to *build more Churches*; but this confirms what is ſignified before, that theſe *very many Churches* were not yet built, but only in deſign, and that with a proſpect of Chriſtians there ſtill increaſing. And the *Bibles*, if they were intended only for C. P. might be for the future Churches, not the preſent only.

His Concluſion is, 'where Chriſtians were ſo multi-'plied that it was neceſſary to build more Churches, 'and to make ſuch proviſions for the multitude of their 'Aſſemblies, it could not be that they ſhould all make 'but one Congregation. He

He should have concluded that which is denied, otherwise all he hath premised will be insignificant, and to no purpose: it is granted that all the Christians at C.P. did make more than *one Congregation*, and for their conveniency met at other times in several Churches. That which is denied is, that the main Body or generality of Christians there could not meet in one Assembly, or did not so meet at this time with their Bishop *Alexander*, as to this he hath proved nothing, and therefore did well to conclude nothing against that which is affirmed to be the plain import of *Theodoret*'s expression.

And it may be supposed that *Theodoret*, if he had not expressed it, *might well think* (though the contrary be suggested) that as great multitudes, as *Constantine*'s Letters signified, might meet together at the Bishop's Church; for himself declares what a vast Congregation he preached to at *Antioch*, having an Auditory of *many Myriads f.* I will not ask him what *Eusebius could think*, when he tells us the Christians had μυριάνδρους ἐπισυναγωγὰς, *Assemblies consisting of Myriads g.* Nor what *Socrates thought*, when he tells us long after, of C. P. that *the whole City became one Assembly*, and *meeting in an Oratory, continued* there all day *h*, Ὅλη πόλις μία ἐκκλησία ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ τῷ εὐκτηρίῳ γενόμενοι, *&c.* But I would have him tell me how he understands that passage of *Chrysostome*, καὶ γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χαρὶ τὴν εἰς δέκα μυριάδων ἀρίθμον οἶμαι τοὺς ἐντάυθα συναγομένους τελεῖν *i.* What is the import of these words? Do they signify that *ten Myriads* were assembled in one place to hear *Chrysostome?* If so, there will be no question but that the generality of Christians might meet in one Church with *Alexander* in *Constantine*'s Reign; for that then, (about 70 years before) there was any thing near so many Christians as an 100000; adhereing to one Bishop in this City, cannot with any reason be imagined.

f Ep. 83.

g Lib. 8. Cap. 1.

h Lib. 7. cap. 23.

i Hom. 85. in Mat. Tom. 2. p. 529.

ed. Or does he mean only, that there were ſo *many Myriads* of Chriſtians contained in that City? If ſo, then he ſaies here no more than in another *Homily* forecited, where the number of Chriſtians in C. P. is computed to be an 100000, reckoning *all beſides Jews and Heathens*. Now if they were no more in his time, they cannot with reaſon be ſuppoſed to have been above half ſo many in *Conſtantine*'s (unleſs any can imagine, that their numbers advanced more in 6 years than in 70, when the ſucceeding Emperours multiplyed the Inhabitants exceſſively, ὑπὲρ τὸν χῶρον, as *Zoſimus* tells us [k], crouding the City ſo full as that they could ſcarce ſtir without danger:) and a great part of theſe were fallen off to *Arius* while *Alexander* was Biſhop: the *Novatians* alſo, were numerous, having ſeveral Churches; and theſe with other Sects being deducted, the Chriſtians there that communicated with *Alexander* will be no more (if ſo many) than belong to ſome one of our Pariſhes.

k *Lib.* 2.

It would ſwell this Preface to too great a Bulk, if I ſhould anſwer the reſt ſo particularly.

Since he deſigned to be ſo breif, and to have ſo ſhort a Preface, I wiſh he had employed more of it againſt that which is the ſtrength of the Diſcourſe he oppoſes, and of more conſequence to the main Cauſe; and not have ſpent ſo many leaves upon a by-paſſage, for which we have little reaſon to be concerned: for if he could make it appear, that the Chriſtians at C. P. in *Conſtantine*'s time were more than could meet in one Congregation, yea, or in two either; that would be far from proving it a *Dioceſan Church*, unleſs ſome one or two of our Pariſhes can be counted ſo.

Let me add in fine, that our *Author* has done juſt nothing towards the diſproving of what *Theodoret* was alledged for; unleſs he ſhew, that C. P. exceeded *old Rome*,

Rome, was furniſhed with ſuch an infinite number of Chriſtians; ſo many (more than two) magnificent Churches there erected, the 50 Bibles thought needful to be provided, and almoſt all the *Heathen* beſides many *Jews* converted; before *Alexander* (who is ſaid to hold this Aſſembly *with all the brethren*) deceaſed; and ſo unleſs he prove that all this was done (which himſelf I think can ſcarce believe) in leſs than a year. For *Valeſius* (upon whoſe authority this *Gentleman* takes much) proves at large (making it the buſineſs of one of his *Books*) that *Alexander* died (and yet muſt live ſome while after this *panegyrical* Aſſembly) in the year 331. And its manifeſt, that C. P. was not built, nor had that name till 331. For tho' it was building the year before, yet it was not finiſhed till 25 of *Conſtantine*'s Reign (as *Jerome* and others:) and the beginning of his Reign is reckoned from the death of *Conſtantius* his Father, who was Conſul with *Maximianus* in the year 306, and died in the middle of it. There needs not a word more to ſhew that all his diſcourſe on this ſubject is wholly inſignificant, and not at all for his purpoſe, tho' this be the moſt conſiderable part of his Preface.

L. 2. obſerv. in Soc. & Soz.

Chronic.

Faſt Conſul.

'This Author gives ſeveral inſtances of ſeveral Biſhops 'being in one City at the ſame time, in anſwer to the 'Dean of *Paul*'s, who affirmed that it was an inviolable 'rule of the Church to have but one, &c. *Jeruſalem* is 'the firſt inſtance, &c. I wonder to find a man of Learning cite this paſſage, than which nothing can be more 'diſadvantageous to his Cauſe.

There is one who I ſuppoſe paſſes for a *man of learning* who for the ſame purpoſe makes uſe of this inſtance, ſince mine was publiſhed; *We have*, ſaith he, *Examples in Eccleſiaſtical ſtory of two Biſhops at the ſame time in the ſame See, and yet this was never thought Schiſmatical, when the ſecond was advanced by the conſent of the firſt.*

Thus Alexander *a Biſhop in* Cappadocia *was made Biſhop of* Jeruſalem *while* Narciſſus *was living, but very old; and* Anatolius *at the ſame time, ſate in the Church of* Cæſarea *with* Theotecnus, *and this was St.* Auſtin's *own caſe, who was made Biſhop of* Hippo *while there was another Biſhop living l.* He ſayes alſo, *Nothing can be more diſadvantageous to my cauſe than this paſſage.* If it had been no advantage to my cauſe, I ſhould have thought it bad enough; but if nothing could be more diſadvantageous, I am very unhappy: let us ſee how it is made good.

l Defence of Dr. St. p. 178.

'*Narciſſus* having retired, and the people not knowing what had become of him, the neighbouring Biſhops ordained *Dius* in his place, who was ſucceeded by *Gordius* and after by *Germanico*, (it ſhould be by *Germanico*, and after by *Gordius*) in whoſe time *Narciſſus* returned, and was deſired to reſume his Office, and did ſo. What became of *Germanico* (he means *Gordius*,) is not ſaid but probably he reſigned or died preſently.

There is nothing to make either of theſe probable, it is altogether as likely, if not more, that he continued Biſhop there with *Narciſſus* for ſome time; but becauſe *Euſebius* ſayes nothing of it, I inſiſt not on it. But beſides he tells us, Narciſſus *took* Alexander, *into the participation of the charge.* That ſignifies *Narciſſus* was not excluded from the Epiſcopal *charge*, both had their parts therein: No, but ſayes he, Alexander *was the Biſhop*, Narciſſus *retained but the name and title only*, that is, he was but a Titular, not really a Biſhop, and why ſo? becauſe *Alexander*, ſayes he, *joined with him in prayers, and the Hiſtorian ſayes he was not able to officiate by reaſon of his great age.* He was not able it may be to perform all the Offices of a Biſhop, but what he was able to do no doubt he performed. Now if they muſt be but *titular* Biſhops, who perform not perſonally all the Offices

fices of a Pastoral charge (when they cannot pretend λιπαρὸν γῆρας) how many *real* Bishops shall we find in the World? But besides the *Name and Title*, did he not retain the Power and Authority of a Bishop? If not, how came he to loose it? Did he *resign*, or was he *deposed*? That he resigned there is not the least intimation in this *Historian* or any other; nor any instance in the antient Church, that ever any Bishop divested himself of all pastoral *Power* upon this account. To have deposed him for his great age had been a barbarous Act, and such as the Church in those times cannot be charged with. No doubt but he retained the Episcopal power, though through Age he could not exercise it in all instances; and if he had not only the *Title* but the *Power*, he was really a Bishop, and there were two Bishops at once in one Church, and then this instance is so far from being *most disadvantageous*, that it serves me with all the advantage I designed in alledging it.

As for the words of *Valesius* cited by him, if they be taken in the sense which our *Author* would have them, that *learned man* will not agree with himself. For but a very few lines before, he says, these two were *Co-Episcopi*, *Bishops together* in that City, *superstite episcopo adjutor & coepiscopus est adjunctus*, And tho' he says (but says it doubtfully with a *ni fallor*) this was forbidden at *Sardica* (above 100 years after); yet he adds that, *notwithstanding it was still usual in the Church, nihil ominus identidem in ecclesia usurpatum est*, which is all that I need desire. And afterwards, where *Eusebius* again mentions two Bishops in one City, he observes, that in one of his Copies, the *Scholiast* has this note upon it in the Margin, καὶ ἐνταῦθα μίαι ἐπισκοπῆς δύο προύστησαν, *here also there were two Bishops of one Church*. *Valesius* adds, *the Scholiast understands* Alexander, *who was Bishop of* Jerusalem *together with* Narcissus.

in *l.* 7. *c.* 32.

The

The next instance is of *Theotecnus* and *Anatolius* who were Bishops of *Cæsarea* together. Against this he hath little to say, I suppose because nothing can be said against it in reason. Only he seems willing that *Anatolius* should pass but as *Episcopus designatus*, whereby if he mean one, who is not yet actually a Bishop, but designed to be one hereafter, as *Eraclius* was by *Augustine*, it is inconsistent with what *Eusebius* says and himself quotes, but one line before, viz. *that* Theotecnus *ordained him Bishop in his life-time*; for if he was not *actually* Bishop after he was thus ordained, he was never Bishop at all *m*.

m *Euseb. l. 7. c. 32.*

Another instance was of *Macarius* and *Maximus* both Bishops at once of *Jerusalem*.

He would not have *Maximus* to be Bishop while *Macarius* lived, because it is said *he was to rule the Church after his Death*.

But *Maximus* was to govern the Church not only after his death, if he survived him (as he was like to do being much younger) but while he lived; and so did actually together with him, συνῆδεν, which denotes the exercise of the same Function together *n*: besides the *Historian* says, *Maximus* was before this ordained Bishop of *Diospolis*, and if he had officiated at *Jerusalem*, where they were so desirous of him, in a lower Capacity; their kindness to him had been a degrading him; which it cannot be supposed they would either offer, or he yield to.

n *Soz. l. 2. c. 19.*

I alledged *Epiphanius, who signifies that other Cities had two Bishops together, and excepts only* Alexandria. To which he answers, *that* Epiphanius *cannot mean that all other Cities had two Bishops at a time*, nay did I say that he meant this, but his expression imports no less than that it was *usual for other Cities to have two Bishops*. Nor is there any reason to think that *Epiphanius* respects only the

the cases alledged; it was quite another case that was the occasion of his words; and diverse other instances might be brought of a different nature and occasion, though this be sufficient to shew, that the rule against two Bishops in one City was not *inviolable*: He adds, 'I 'do not see what advantage can be made of this pas-'sage.

This *passage* shews that there was commonly two Bishops in a City at once, *Alexandria* is only excepted as varying herein from other Cities. And this is *advantage* enough *for me*, and it is enough *against him* too; and leaves no reason for his pretence that it was only in *extraordinary cases*. I affirmed it *could not be* Epiphanius *his meaning (as a great Antiquary would have it) that* Alexandria *was never so divided, as that several parties in it should have their respective Bishops there*, and brought several Instances to evince it: *for so it was divided in the time of* Epiphanius, *when the Catholicks had* Athanasius, *the* Arians *had* Gregorius, *and then* Georgius; *and afterwards the one had* Peter *the other* Lucius, *and the* Novatians *had their Bishops successively in that City till* Cyril's *time.*

'He answers however I do not see why that learned 'Antiquarie's opinion may not be maintained against this 'Gentleman's objections, he sayes that *Alexandria* was 'divided before *Epiphanius* his time between several Bi-'shops (I said in *Epiphanius*'s time) it cannot be denied. 'But that is not the thing *Epiphanius* speaks of, but that 'before the Election of *Theonas* against *Athanasius*, 'there were never two opposite Bishops as in other 'Churches.

But this doth neither *agree* with the one nor *defend* the other; it agrees not with *Epiphanius*, but makes him contradict himself, for he tells us there were two opposite Bishops at *Alexandria* before *Theonas* was cho-

sen.

ſen. For this was not till *Alexander's* death, but he ſayes *Piſtus* was made Biſhop there by the *Arians* while *Alexander* was living *o*. And he could not be ignorant of what *Euſebius* declares *p*, that upon the diviſion in *Egypt* occaſioned by *Arius*, in every City, κατ' ἐκκλησίαν πόλιν, *there was Biſhop againſt Biſhop*, and People againſt People. Nor doth it *defend* the *Antiquary*, for he ſpeaks univerſally without limiting himſelf to the Election of *Theonas*, *Eccleſiam Alexandrinam nunquam in partes ſciſſam quarum ſingulæ Epiſcopum ſuum habebant, that Church was never divided ſo as to have oppoſite Biſhops.*

o Her. 69. Num. 8. p. 733.
p Vita Conſt. l. 3. cap. 4.

'The inſtances are all later than this Fact, and there-'fore are inſignificant, ſayes he.

They are fully *ſignificant*, both in reference to the *Antiquary* againſt whom they are brought to prove that he miſtook *Epiphanius*, when he would have it to be his meaning, that *Alexandria* was never ſo divided as to have two oppoſite Biſhops; for they ſhew it was often ſo divided: and alſo in reference to *Epiphanius*, they were ſo late as his time on purpoſe, to ſhew more unqueſtionably, that could not be his meaning, which was againſt his knowledge, and notorious inſtances in his own time.

But he will not deny the *inſtance of the Novatians to be ſignificant, only* Socrates *does not ſay that they had their Biſhops ſucceſſively to* Cyril's *time.*

Nor do I ſay he does; but he ſayes Cyrill *ſhut up the* Novatian *Churches there, and took away all the ſacred treaſure in them, and deprived their Biſhop* Theopompus *of all he had.* Now when our *Author* meets with Churches, and a *Biſhop* over them; he is not wont to queſtion a *Succeſſion*, unleſs it appears he was the firſt.

'It may be they began there after this time, for there 'is little Account in Church-Hiſtory, that I know, of 'any *Novatians* in *Alexandria* before *Athanaſius*,

We

We are little concerned about this, yet it may be they began before this time, *for there is no account at all in Church Hiſtory, that the* Novatians *began there in, or after* Athanaſius *his time.*

I had produced evidence that many *African Biſhops* declared, in the caſe of *Valerius* and *Auſtin*, that it was *uſual* in all parts, to have two Biſhops in a City at once; to this he anſwers, 'but ſuppoſe all this true, that this 'might be maintained by the Examples of ſeveral 'Churches, what is it that two Biſhops may be in one 'Church? no, that is not the matter, but that a Biſhop 'when he growes old, may appoint or ordain his Suc-'ceſſour, to *prevent the miſchiefs, that are uſually produced* 'by popular Elections.

If what the *African Biſhops* did alledge, were reſtrained to that particular *caſe* he contends for; yet this is enough to make good all I intend, viz. that *uſually* in the antient Church, there *were two Biſhops together in one place.* For when one is ordained Biſhop in the ſame place, when another is ſtill living; with whatever deſign, upon what occaſion ſoever this is done, yet there are two Biſhops at once in the ſame place.

I ſee no reaſon why this ſhould be reſtrained to that *particular caſe*, the occaſion of what the Biſhops affirm may clear it, and that was *Auſtin's* ſcruple, not to ſucceed *Valerius*, but to be made Biſhop of *Hippo*, while his Biſhop there was living, *Epiſcopatum ſuſcipere, ſuo vivente Epiſcopo, recuſabat*, for ſo there would be two together, which he took to be againſt the Cuſtom of the Church, *contra morem Eccleſiæ*; but they all perſwade him that this was uſually done, *id fieri ſolere*, and prove it by examples in all parts *q*. And *Valerius* his deſire and propoſal was, that *Auſtin* might be ordained Biſhop of *Hippo*, *Qui ſuæ Cathedræ non tam ſuccederet ſed Conſacerdos accederet, not as one that was to ſucceed him only, but to be Biſhop together with him.*

q *Poſſidon. vita Auguſt. cap. 8.*

When he assigns this as the reason of appointing a a Successour, to *prevent the mischiefs that are usually produced by popular elections*, he speaks his own sence, not theirs; for they were better advised than to brand the general practice of the ancient Church as *mischievous*, and how this suggestion becomes one, who undertakes to write a *vindication of the Primitive Church*, let himself consider. Others may judge it, a more intollerable reflection upon the universal Church in the best and after times, than any *M. B.* can be justly charged with. However the reason assigned for it by *Possidonius* is another thing than appears in this Authors whole account, it was because *Valerius feared lest some other Church, should seek him for their Bishop, and get a person so approved, from him.*

Ibid.

Whereas in fine he sayes, 'These Cases specified 'were not thought to violate the Rule that allowed but 'one Bishop to a City. Yet it was thought so by St. *Austin*, when he excuses his suffering himself to be made Bishop with *Valerius, by this*, that he knew not it was forbidden by a *rule* of the *Nicene Council*, *Quod Concilio Niceno prohibitum fuisse nesciebam*, and gives this as the reason why he would not so ordain *Eradius*.

Next he would prove, that this *provision for a successour does not destroy that Rule*, by an instance, I need not transcribe it at large, the sum of it is this, *when the Government is Monarchical, if it fall out* once (in many Ages, as it did in *England* once in above 500 years) *that another King be crowned, besides him who hath the Throne; yet it will be true enough, that it is the rule of those Kingdoms to have but one King.* To which I say briefly, if it be *usual* to have two Kings in such a Government, it will scarce be thought true, that it is *the inviolable Rule* of those Kingdoms, to have but one King. And then how this instance will sute his purpose,

poſe let thoſe judge who take notice, that, I have already proved it *uſual* in the antient Church for Cities in all parts to have *two Biſhops at once.*

From *pag.* 12. he paſſes to *pag.* 23. To ſhew there were more Biſhopricks than one in the Region or Dioceſs of *Hippo* I brought ſeveral inſtances; and might have produced more, but that I confined my ſelf to thoſe which the learned *Dean* alledged to the contrary. *Fuſſala* is one of them, and that alone this *Gentleman* takes notice of. St. *Auſtin* calls it *Caſtellum* diverſe times in one Epiſtle. He finds fault that I tranſlate *Caſtellum* a *Caſtle.* I did no more expect to be blamed for this, than if I had render'd *Oppidum* a Town. But I ſuppoſe he counts it no great crime, ſince he runs into it himſelf and in a few lines after calls it a *Caſtle.*

'But theſe Caſtles, ſayes he, were Garriſon Towns, 'with a good dependance of Villages belonging to 'them.

They were Fortreſſes, and ſometimes had Villages depending on them, and might contain ſo many buildings as there are in ſome Village or little Town; however he calls them *Caſtles*, and may give me leave to do ſo too.

He adds, "It was 40 miles diſtant from *Hippo*, and 'was in St. *Auſtine*'s Dioceſs, and never had a Biſhop of its own.

It is ſaid indeed to belong to the *Dioceſs of* Hippo, but I do not find it ſaid to be in St. *Auſtine's Dioceſs* or Biſhoprick; theſe are two things and ſhould not be confounded. When it is ſaid to *belong to the Dioceſs of* Hippo, ſo farr diſtant, Dioceſs is not taken as an *Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe* as it is with us, for part of a Countrey under the Government of *one* Biſhop; but as it was uſed in *Africa* in a *civil* ſenſe, for part of a Province, without reſpect to *one Biſhop*, or to *any one Biſhop* at all. Some

parts there call'd Dioceſſes *had no Biſhops, nor were to have any* by Decrees of the *African Councils* r. Other places called a *Dioceſs* had more Biſhops than *one*. *Petilian* ſayes, that in the place where his Collegue *Januarius* was Biſhop there were 4 Biſhops beſides, all five in *una Diœceſi* s. And thus it was in many other places, particularly in that called the *Dioceſs of* Hippo, as I ſhew'd by diverſe inſtances, and St. *Auſtin*'s own Teſtimony.

r *Con. Carth. 2. Can. 5. Codt Afric. 53.*

s *Coll. Carth. D. 1 Num. 117.*

Hereby it appears that in *Africa*, a *Dioceſs* and a *Biſhoprick* were not the ſame thing, though they be with us. There were diverſe Dioceſſes and no Biſhopricks and many Biſhopricks where but one Dioceſs; ſo that *Fuſſala* and 20 other Caſtles and Towns might be in the *Dioceſs of* Hippo, *at* 40 *miles diſtance* or more; and yet St. *Auſtin*'s Biſhoprick, not one jot the larger for it, nor he more a Dioceſan.

Whereas he adds, *that it never had a Biſhop of its own.* It is unqueſtionable that *Fuſſala* had a Biſhop of its own in *Auſtin*'s time; and this renders it wholly unſerviceable to their purpoſe; for the Biſhoprick of *Hippo*, ſaid to be *of* 40 *miles extent*, will not upon the count of *Fuſſala* be 40 yards larger. Nor will either of theſe Biſhops, nor any other in that Region be Dioceſans; unleſs there can be two Dioceſans, and I know not how many more, in *one Dioceſs.*

I aſſigned this reaſon, why *Fuſſala* had not a Biſhop ſooner, becauſe *Auſtin* declares, *there was not one Catholick in it*, and ſuppoſed this might ſerve the turn, not dreaming that thoſe who count all the people in a very large Pariſh, or in an 100 Pariſhes little enough for a Dioceſan; could think his Dioceſs competently furniſhed when he had not *one Soul* (or but ſome few) in communion with him.

He ſayes, *the Town or Caſtle indeed had none, but the County belonging to it had ſome*; he will have the Territory

tory or Pariſh depending on this *Caſtle* to be a *County*. I cannot but obſerve the admirable power of a fancy tinctured and prepoſſeſſed. It will turn a *Pariſh* into a *County*, and a *Caſtle* into a *County Town*; and ſince a *County* with us, was a *Province* with them, one *Province* muſt be as much as all *Africa*; and a very ſmall *part* of *Numidia*, muſt be far greater than the *whole*. But there are ſome *Hypotheſes*, which may ſtand in need of ſuch imaginations.

However he likes not my reaſon, and why? becauſe, *though it had no Catholicks in it then, it might have ſome before* and concludes it had, *becauſe it belonged heretofore to the Dioceſs of Hippo.*

" But that it formerly had Catholicks, (ſaies he) we " may conclude by Mr. *Baxter's* reaſoning, becauſe it " belonged heretofore to the Dioceſs of *Hippo.*

If *Dioceſs* be taken in a *civil* ſenſe (as it is frequently in *African* Authors) this will be no proof, that *there had been any Catholicks in it*, becauſe in this ſenſe *Fuſſala* might belong to that Dioceſs, though there had not been either Chriſtian or Biſhop in the whole Region: Nor will it be hereby proved, taking it in the Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe; for that part of *Hippo*, which was under the *Donatiſt* Biſhop, had no Catholick; and yet *de jure*, as he tells us, belonged to the Dioceſs, (as he calls it,) or charge of St. *Auſtin.* Yet ſince he allows Mr. *Baxter's* Argument, he muſt admit what it concludes, *viz.* that a place that hath no Chriſtians or Catholicks in it, belongs to no Biſhop; and then *Fuſſala* never belonged to St. *Auſtin* as its Biſhop; either *before* it had Catholicks, for againſt this the Argument is admitted to be concluſive: not *after*, for then it had a Biſhop of its own. And ſo all they have to alledge for the largeneſs of St. *Auſtin's* Biſhoprick comes to nothing.

" So

"So that I conceive the reaſon will not hold, for its "having no Biſhop of its own, ſince the ſame reaſon "deſtroys its dependence upon the the Dioceſs of *Hippo*, "which is expreſly affirmed.

The reaſon I gave for its having no Biſhop, was, becauſe St. *Auſtin* declares *there was no Catholick in it.* This reaſon will *hold*, unleſs they think a place may have a Biſhop where there are no Chriſtians at all; when as yet they judge, that a place which hath Chriſtians enough to make a *good Congregation*, or *many*, ought not to have a Biſhop. Whereas he ſayes this reaſon *deſtroys its dependance upon the Dioceſs*, I wonder what *dependance* he imagines, ſince it is ſuch, as both the *not having* of Chriſtians, and alſo the *having of them*, deſtroys it. The former he here affirms, *the ſame reaſon* (which is its not having of Catholicks) *deſtroys it*; the latter is undeniable, for when *Fuſſala* had a competent number of Catholicks, a Biſhop was there conſtituted; and then it depended no more on the *Dioceſs* of *Hippo*, than one Biſhop's Church depends on another, when both are independent.

The dependance of *Fuſſala* upon *Hippo* was ſuch, as that of a Countrey place upon a greater Town well furniſhed with Officers for their help, to convert and reduce the Inhabitants, and when enough are converted to help them to a Biſhop or Paſtor. This St. *Auſtin* did for *Fuſſala*, he imployed Presbyters to reduce the Donatiſts there, and when they were reduced, he adds them not to his own charge, would not have them *Epiſcopo cedere*; but adviſes them to have a Biſhop of their own, and procures one for them. This was the practice of the primitive times, in theſe methods were Churches and Biſhops multiplyed; it was not out of uſe in the *fifth Age*, this of *Fuſſala* as managed by St. *Auſtin* is a remarkable inſtance thereof; and if other Biſhops had imitated

imitated him, as he did the Apoſtles, and beſt Ages, the Church would not have been troubled with debates about *Dioceſans*.

That *Auſtin* would not take the Charge of a Place ſo far off as *Fuſſala*, he will have it *aſcribed to his Modeſty*. But it was ſuch *Modeſty* as this excellent Perſon made Conſcience of, being convinced *certiſſimâ ratione*, by *moſt certain reaſon*, that he was not ſufficient for it. If all other Biſhops had been ſo *modeſt*, ſo conſcientious, there might have been, as *Nazianzen* ſpeaks, when Biſhops were multiplyed in *Cappadocia*, Ψυχῶν ἐπιλειπτοτέρων, a much more deſirable thing, to thoſe that *love Souls*, than a great Dioceſs.

He gives a reaſon why this muſt be aſcribed to St. *Auſtin's modeſty*, becauſe *he diſcharged the Office of a Biſhop there, in more difficult times, while the Presbyter he imployed there, were barbarouſly uſed.*

I need not deny that he performed the *Office of a Biſhop* there; for it is the office of a Biſhop to endeavour by himſelf or others, the converting or reducing of all that he can. Only this will not prove *Fuſſala* to be then a part of his Biſhoprick, no more than it will prove *Athanaſius* to have been Biſhop of *India*; becauſe he encouraged, and ſent *Frumentius* with others thither, to convert the *Indians* t.

t *Soz. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 23.

The learned *Dean* had cited *Auſtin* as calling himſelf the Biſhop of that *Dioceſs* (underſtanding by it a Region of vaſt extent.) I obſerved that in the Epiſtle quoted he onely ſaith he had the *Epiſcopal charge of* Hippo. By this the Gentleman changing my words, will have me to ſignifie, that he was the Biſhop of the *Town only*. This I did not intend, but that he was not *the only Biſhop* of that whole Region. But whether he was Biſhop of part of the Town only, or of that and ſome part of the Region alſo, I am not much concerned. His words are

as

" as if he had been Biſhop of the Town only, nay, but " of part of that neither, for the *Donatiſts* had their " Biſhop there: ſo this will ſtrangely diminiſh the Bi- " ſhoprick of St. *Auſtin* which at firſt appeared ſo large. Then he anſwers, for *the Donatiſts having a Biſhop there, it ſignifies little to our preſent purpoſe, ſince he was but an Uſurper.*

But this ſignifies as much to my purpoſe as I need; for the *Donatiſts* having a Biſhoprick in *Hippo*, St. *Auſtin's* muſt needs be diminiſhed thereby, and altogether as much leſſened, as if they had not been *Uſurpers*. And they were counted no otherwiſe *Uſurpers*, but ſo that if the *Donatiſt* Biſhop had been reconciled; by a Decree of the *African* Church he was to continue in his Biſhop-there, as a *rightful Poſſeſſour*, and there would have been ſtill two Dioceſſes (ſuch as they were) in one Town.

He would have us *believe Auſtin* as if he declared, that he was not the Biſhop of the Town only; but his words are, *Ut modum diſpenſationis meæ non ſupergrediar hoc Eccleſiæ ad Hipponenſem Regionem pertinenti prodeſſe conteſtor*, which, ſayes our Author, plainly ſignifies, *that all the Church belonging, not only to the Town, but but alſo to the Region of* Hippo, *belonged to him.*

But if he pleaſe to view the words again which himſelf hath quoted, he will find it plainly ſignifyed, that Auſtin's *Church belonged to the Region of* Hippo, *but not that all the Church both in Town and Region, belonged to him. Antonius* Biſhop of *Fuſſala* might have ſaid this as truly of his Church there, as *Auſtin* did it of his Church at *Hippo*; it did *ad Hipponenſem Regionem pertinere*, belong to the Region of *Hippo*. And it may be as juſtly inferred from hence, that all the Church both in the Town and Region of *Hippo* belonged to the Biſhop of *Fuſſala*. If our Author will allow of this (as he muſt if he will ſtand

ſtand to his own account of this paſſage) *Auſtin*'s Biſhoprick will be *ſtrangely diminiſhed* indeed, it muſt be confined to a part of *Hippo*, and made leſs than I repreſent it. For I did not ſay, nor had I any need to aſſert, that he was Biſhop of the Town only. We may allow him beſides his part of the Town, diverſe Villages in the Countrey (though I have not ſeen it proved) without any danger of aſſigning him a *Dioceſan* Church. For *Kidderminſter* (as one tells us, who very well knows it) hath 20 Villages belonging to it, and ſome thouſands of Souls therein, yet according to our modern meaſures will ſcarce make a *Dioceſan* Church *u*.

u M. B. *of Epiſcopacy, Part* 2. *p.* 9.

To ſhew that there were *more Biſhops in the Region of* Hippo, than St. *Auſtin*, beſides particular inſtances (which he paſſes by) I alledged a paſſage of his where the *Donatiſts* were deſired to *meet together with the Catholick Biſhops, that were in that Region, and who there ſuffered ſo much by the Donatiſts :* to this he anſwers, "That theſe Biſhops who are ſaid to be in *Regione Hipponenſi*, were not the Biſhops of that *Region*, but "ſome Biſhops of the *Province* met together there.

But that theſe were Biſhops of the *Province* met together there, is a meer conjecture of his own, without the leaſt ground either in this paſſage or any other in that *Epiſtle*. It will not be hard to anſwer any thing at this rate. If there had been a *Provincial* Council then held in that *Region*, there might have been ſome pretence for what he ſayes; but there is not any hint of this in the whole *Epiſtle*. That which is deſired is a *Meeting for conference*, *Hoc eſt ergo deſiderium noſtrum, &c. Primum ſi fieri poteſt ut cum Epiſcopis noſtris pacificè conferatis*——, *ideo nos conferre volumus*——, and the prime occaſion of it was the outrages committed in that Region by the *Donatiſts*, wherein the Biſhops of that place were particularly concerned. This is ſignifyed,

fyed, as in other parts of the Epiſtle, ſo particularly in the *paſſage cited*, *Epiſcopos noſtros qui ſunt in Regione Hipponenſi, ubi tanta mala patimur*. This Meeting was to be with the *Catholick* Biſhops upon the place, in *Regione Hipponenſi*, not any to be call'd from other parts. And theſe words ſeem brought in to prevent an objection which the *Donatiſts* might make againſt a more general, or more publick meeting, as that which might bring them in danger of the Laws in force againſt them; *An fortè iſtæ leges Imperatoris vos non permittunt noſtros Epiſcopos convenire*, and then immediately follows theſe words in anſwer to it, *Ecce interim Epiſcopos noſtros qui ſunt in Regione Hipponenſi*, &c. ſo that this to me ſeems the plain ſence of both Objection and anſwer; If becauſe of the Laws you dare not meet us in a more General or Provincial Council, yet give a Meeting to the Biſhops of this particular Region, where there can be no apprehenſion of danger. All which makes me judge, what he ſayes concerning the *Biſhops of the Province* as here intended, to be no better than an Evaſion.

To prove that there was but one Biſhop in the Region of *Hippo*, he tells us, "That the Clergy there cal-"led in the Inſcription of an Epiſtle, *Clerici Regionis* "*Hipponenſium*, ſpeaking of the Biſhop of *Hippo*, do call "him their Biſhop, and not one of their Biſhops, *&c.*

But the Clergy ſo called, may be only the Clergy of *Hippo*, and ſo they are in the Title of the Epiſtle *Clerici Hippone Catholici*: and well may they of *Hippo* be called the Clergy of the *Region*, both becauſe they were in that Region, and were the Clergy of it κατ' ἐξοχὴν. But if the expreſſion ſhould be extended to *more* or to *all* in the Region, their calling him *Epiſcopus noſter*, will be no proof that they had no other Biſhop, but him at *Hippo*. For that phraſe

phraſe *Epiſcopus noſter* or *Epiſcopi noſtri*, all along in this Epiſtle, doth not denote the Biſhop of that *particular Church* to which they belonged (as he would have it) but a Biſhop of their *party* or *perſwaſion*. So they call *Valentinus noſtrum Catholicum Epiſcopum*, who yet was not Biſhop of *Hippo*. So they call them *Epiſcopos noſtros*, whom they deſired the Donatiſts to meet once and again *w*, and thrice in another page, where our *Author* finds *Epiſcopos noſtros x*. He may have many more inſtances hereof in that Epiſtle. If there was ſo many Biſhops in *Hippo* or in that Region, as the Clergy call *Epiſcopos noſtros*, he muſt grant many more Biſhops in that Region than I need deſire. So that this *Phraſe* however it be underſtood, is a *medium* unhappily choſen: if it be taken in *my ſenſe* it is impertinent and can conclude nothing for him; if it be taken in his *own ſenſe*, it will conclude directly againſt him.

w *pag.* 373.
x *pag.* 371.

He paſſes to *Alexandria*, and to *pag.* 32. *The inſtance of* Mareotis *he ſayes little to*, ſo our Author, I might think it enough, where there was ſo little occaſion.

"He inſinuates as if *Mareotis* might not have number "enough of Chriſtians to have a Biſhop, but this *Atha-*"*naſius* does ſufficiently ſhew to be a groundleſs con-"jecture.

I had no intention or occaſion to ſignifie that *Mareotis* had not Chriſtians enough to have a Biſhop, I knew that it both had many Chriſtians, and a Biſhop alſo, and named him too; and therefore the *groundleſs conjecture* may be fixed ſomewhere elſe.

"And even before *Athanaſius*, the generality of the "People there were Chriſtians.

How long before? *Dionyſius* in the latter part of the third Age declares it ἔρημον τῶν ἀδελφῶν, quite *deſtitute of Chriſtians y*, and the gaining the generality there, to the Faith, required ſome conſiderable time, and it is

y *Euſeb. l.* 7. *c.* 11.

like proceeded not far, till Christianity generally prevailed.

Besides *Ischyras*, I had mentioned *Dracontius*, both Bishops in the *Territory* of *Alexandria* (as *Agathammon* also was z) of *Dracontius* he takes notice, and sayes, *possibly he was a Chorepiscopus.*

z *Apol.2.p.612.*

But a Chorepiscopus is elsewhere with him a *Diocesan a*, and here he sayes that he did *accept a Bishoprick.* Now these put together will go near to make a *Diocesan* Bishop. But then if there were two or three Bishops in the Dioceſs of *Alexandria*, besides *Athanasius*; they will scarce be so much as half *Dioceſans.*

a *pag.* 590.

He sayes *Athanasius preſs'd him to accept it.* If so this great Person was no more unwilling to have another Bishop in his *Dioceſs*, and in a *Countrey place* too, than *Austin* was to have one at *Fussala.* He sayes further this was an *extraordinary case*, though what was *extraordinary* in it I cannot imagine; to prove any thing there mentioned to be so, will be an hard task.

"And allowing this man a Countrey Bishoprick, "that of *Alexandria* would be a great deal too bigg for "the Congregational measure.

And so it might be, and yet be no *Dioceſan* Church; if that will satisfie him which is *too big for those measures*, he seems content to drop his cause, and may leave it in the hands of *Presbyterians.* And he is in the more danger, because he seems not apprehensive of it, but counts it enough if he thinks a Church is any where found larger than *one* Congregation.

I had given instances of several Towns that had Bishops, and were but two or three or four *&c.* miles distant one from another this he denies not: but asks *what does this conclude? might not those Dioceſſes be yet much larger than one Congregation?*

I might conclude that these were just such *Diocesses* as our Countrey Parishes are; and had such Congregations as those Parish Churches have. And some of them in time might have provision (as some of ours have) for more Congregations than one. And if our *modern Diocesses* were of this proportion, they would be much more conformable to the *antient* Modells.

"Suppose the chief Congregations of *Holland* had "each a Bishop, yet I conceive they would be Dioce-"sans, though those Cities lie very close together.

He might have laid the *scene* at home, where we are better acquainted, and supposed this of our Countrey Towns; or of both the *chief*, and *lesser* Towns in *Holland*; if he had designed what would be most parallel. But to take it as it is formed, though those Cities lay not further distant, and had each of them a Bishop, yet if their Churches were governed in common by Bishop and Presbyters, as the antient Churches were; they would not be *Diocesan*, but more like the Model of the Churches and Government which *Holland* hath at present.

"And now after all this, though we have several in-"stances out of *Egypt*, how near Cities were together "in some parts; yet upon the whole account the Dio-"cesses do appear to be large enough, from the num-"ber of them.

He would have us think where Cities are *so near together* (as I had shewed) yet because of *their number* the Diocesses might be large enough. But where they were so near together, they could not be large enough to make any thing like the modern Diocesses, no, nor larger than our Countrey Parishes if they had Bishops in them. And the Ancients thought themselves obliged by the *Apostle*'s rule to have a Bishop, not only in some but in every City, ἐπισκόπων ἔδει πολλῶν, sayes *Chrysostome*,

b In 1 Tim. Hom. 11.

stome, καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν προηγησαμένων *b*, and *Theophilact* expresses κατὰ πόλιν by καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν, without exception of the smallness of the place or its nearness to others. The reason diverse Cities had none, was the want, or the inconsiderable number of Christians in them. Nothing but this hindered any City from having a Bishop in the four first Ages; though the greatest part of their Cities (as may be made manifest) were no greater than our Market-Towns or fairer Villages. And upon this account many Cities might want Bishops, and it may be did so, in *Egypt* particularly; *Heathenisme* prevailing in many places there, even in *Athanasius* his time; for which I could produce sufficient evidence; but will not now digress so far. Afterwards the affectation of *greatness* in *some*, was the occasion of new measures; and orders were made that Towns which had no Bishops before should have none after: though the reason why they had none before was gone; and those places had as many or more Christians in them, than most Episcopal Cities had of old.

c Athan. Apol. 2.

" For in *Athanasius* his time there were not an hun-
" dred Bishops in all *Egypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis* *c*.

I was a little surprized to read this, and see *Athanasius* cited for it. For I knew that *Athanasius* reckons 95 Bishops from *Egypt* besides himself, at the Council of *Sardica*; and others from *Africa*, wherein *Lybia* and *Pentapolis* are usually included; and it was never known that a major part or a third of the Bishops in a Countrey, did come to a *Council* at such a distance as *Egypt* was from *Sardica*. It is scarce credible that *Athanasius* would so far contradict himself, as to say there were not so many Bishops in all those *three* Countreys, when he had signifyed there were many more in *one* of them. Some mistake I thought there must be, and consulting the place I found it not intirely represented.

There

There is this Clauſe (immediately following the words he cites) left out, οὐδεὶς τούτων ἡμᾶς ἐμέμψατο, *none of theſe accuſed me*, whereby it appears that the meaning of the whole paſſage is this, *there was an hundred Biſhops in the Dioceſs of* Egypt *who appeared not againſt him*, or that favoured him. But thoſe who favoured *Arius* (whom he calls *Euſebians*) and *Meletius*, to ſay nothing of *Colluthus* (for into ſo many parties was that Countrey then divided) are not taken into the reckoning; otherwiſe it would have amounted to many more than an hundred. *Sozomen* ſayes the Biſhops there, who took *Arius* his part were many, πολλοὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων *d*, and in *Athanaſius* there is an account of many *Meletian* Biſhops by name *e*; and in *Epiphanius* it is ſaid, that *in every Region* through which *Meletius* paſſed, and *in every place where he came he made Biſhops f*.

d *Lib.* 1. *c.* 14.

e *Apol.* 2. *p.* 614.

f *Ep. Her.* 68.

The next thing he takes notice of is the defence of Mr. *Baxter's* Allegation out of *Athanaſius*, to ſhew, that all *the Chriſtians of* Alexandria (M. *B*'s words are, the main body of the Chriſtians in *Alexandria*) *could meet in one Church.*

"It is to be confeſſed that the expreſſions of that "Father ſeem to favour him, πᾶσι πᾶσαι ἐκκλησίαι and that "the Church did πᾶσαι ἐκκλησίαι hold all, *&c.*

I am made more confident by all that is ſaid to the contrary, that the evidence is really ſuch, as will need no favour, if it can meet with Juſtice.

"Now ſuppoſe that all the Chriſtians in *Alexandria*, "the Catholicks at leaſtwiſe, could meet together in "that great Church, yet all the Dioceſs could not.

All that was undertaken to be proved by the paſſage in queſtion, was, that the *main body of Chriſtians in* Alexandria adhereing to *Athanaſius* could, and did meet in that one Church. If this be granted nothing is denied that he intended to prove. As for a *Dioceſs* in the Countrey,

Countrey, if he will ſhew us what, or where it was, and that it *had no other Biſhop in it*, he will do ſomething that may be conſidered; yet nothing at all againſt what this Teſtimony was made uſe of to evince.

He ſayes 2dly, "Suppoſe this great great Church "could receive all the multitude, yet if that multitude "was too great for Perſonal Communion it is inſignifi-"cant.

Upon this *ſuppoſition* it might be too great for an ordinary meeting in the Congregational way, yet not big enough for a Dioceſan Church. But the *ſuppoſition* is groundleſs and contradicts *Athanaſius* who ſayes they had Perſonal Communion, *they all prayed together*, and did not only meet within the Walls, but *concurred in the worſhip, and ſaid, Amen.*

He ſayes 3dly, "Before the Church of *Alexandria* "met in diſtinct Congregations, but we are told that "*thoſe places were very ſmall, ſhort and ſtrait places.*

All theſe *ſave one*, I ſaid, which he ought not to have omitted. And they were ſo *ſmall*, becauſe thoſe who were wont to meet in them ſeverally, ſo as to fill them, could all meet in one Church, and did ſo as *Athanaſius* declares.

"But that they were ſuch Chappels or Churches, as "ſome of our Pariſhes in *England* have as great a num-"ber as *Alexandria*, is hardly credible.

I know not how thoſe places could be well expreſſed with more diminution than *Athanaſius* hath done it, he ſayes they were not only *ſtrait* and *ſmall*, but the very *ſmalleſt*. If he will make it appear that our Churches or Chappels are leſs than thoſe that were βραχύτατοι, I ſhall underſtand that which I could never before, that ſomething is *leſs* than that which is *leaſt of all*. But he will prove they were not ſo *ſmall*, becauſe firſt *the Church of* Alexandria *was very numerous from the begin-*

ning

ning. Why it ſhould be counted ſo very *numerous from the beginning*, I know no reaſon, but the miſtake of an *Hiſtorian* who will have a *Sect* of the *Jews* (which was numerous in or about *Alexandria*) to be Chriſtians.

" And if they met all in one place it muſt conſequent-
" ly be very large.

The ground of the conſequence is removed, *Valeſius* his own Author ſayes they had *but one Church to meet in*, *in* Dionyſius *his time*, almoſt 3 Ages from the beginning *g*. If that one was large, yet it is not like that it ſtood till *Athanaſius* his time; after ſo many *Edicts* for demoliſhing of all Chriſtian Churches, and a ſevere Execution of them in *Diocletian*'s Perſecution. g pag. 64

" Nor is it likely they ſhould divide till they were
" grown too numerous for the biggeſt Meeting-place
" they could conveniently have.

It is as *likely* as that *Athanaſius* ſpeaks truth, in a matter which he perfectly knew; he tells us they did *divide*, and yet were not too numerous for *one great Church*, in which they met conveniently too; yea, better than when diſperſed in thoſe little places, as he ſayes and proves, τοῦτο βέλτιον ἦν, *&c.*

2dly, He ſayes, " Though before the *Empire* was con-
" verted they might be confined to little places, and
" forced to meet ſeverally; yet after *Conſtantine* became
" Chriſtian, it is not likely that the *Alexandrians* would
" content themſelves with *ſmall* and *ſtrait* Chappels.

Nor did they content themſelves with thoſe little ones, for beſides this built in *Athanaſius* his time, there was one greater than thoſe ſmall ones finiſhed in *Alexander*'s time, where the body of Catholicks aſſembled with *Alexander*, the other places being too ſtrait, στενῶν ὄντων ἄλλων τῶν τόπων, this is *that one* I excepted, when I ſaid (after *Athanaſius*) that *the reſt*, *all ſave one*, *were exceeding ſmall*. But is it any proof that theſe were not

very small which *Athanasius* represents as such, because there was one (expresly excepted from that number) something larger? As for what he adds, that *then every ordinary City, built very great and magnificent Cathedrals*, it is easily said, but will never be proved.

" 3dly, Some of these Churches had been built with " a design of receiving as many as well could have per- " sonal Communion in Worship together.

Neither will this hold, unless some of those Churches could have received *all*, which had *Personal Communion* with *Athanasius* in this greatest Church; which he denies, and makes use of to *Constantius* as a plea why he made use of the *greatest*.

" As *Theonas* is said by *Athanasius* to have built a " Church bigger than any of those they had before.

Where *Theonas* is said by *Athanasius* to have built a Church, *&c.* I find not, nor does he direct us where it may be found, I suppose for very good Reason. Indeed *Athanasius* in this *Apology* speaks of a Church called *Theonas* (it's like in memory of a former Bishop of that place) where he sayes the multitude of Catholicks met with *Alexander*, συνήγων ἐκεῖ δὲ τὸ πλῆθος; in like Circumstances, as a greater multitude assembled with himself in the new Church, which was greater, and pleads *Alexander*'s example in defence of what he did. But *Theonas* could not build this Church, for he was dead many years before, being Predecessour to *Peter* whom *Achillas* and *Alexander* succeeded *h*.

h Euseb. l. 7. c. ult. Theodoret l. 1. c. 2.

" And yet this and all the rest were but few and strait " in comparison of the great multitude of Catholicks " that were in *Alexandria*.

I expected another Conclusion, but if this be all, he might have spared the premisses; for one part of it we assert, the other we need not deny, only adding with *Athanasius*, that the *greatest* Church was capable δέξασθαι πάντας, *of receiving this great multitude.* But

But here he ſticks, and will wriggle a little more, "But "I conceive, ſayes he, after all this, that the expreſſi- "ons of *Athanaſius* do not conclude that all the Chriſti- "ans in *Alexandria* were met in this great Church.

That *all* and *every one* did come, was never imagined. It is but the *main body* of the Catholicks that M. *B.* intends, as our *Author* obſerves a little before.

"For the *tumultuous manner* in which they came to "their Biſhop to demand a general Aſſembly, makes it "probable that not only Women and Children, would "be glad to abſent themſelves, but *many more*, either "apprehenſive of the effect of this *tumultuous proceeding*, "or of the danger of ſuch a crowd.

The Women he will not admit; but was it ever known that ſuch a great and ſolemn Aſſembly for Worſhip conſiſted only of Men? Were not the Women in Communion with *Athanaſius*'s Chriſtians, that they muſt be left out, when he ſayes all the Catholicks met? Can *all* be truly ſaid to aſſemble when the *farr greater part* (*Women*, *Children* and his *many more*) were abſent? Are not the Women in the *Primitive* Church often noted for ſuch Zeal for the Worſhip of Chriſt, as made them contemn far greater dangers, than here they had any cauſe to be apprehenſive of? The ſuppoſed *danger* was either from the *Crowd* or the *Tumult*. For the former, did *the Women* and *many more* never come to Chriſtian Aſſemblies, when there was any danger of being *crowded*? I think there was as great danger from a *crowd* in *Baſiliſcus* his Reign, when the *whole City* of *C. P.* is ſaid *to have met together in a Church with the Emperour*, but yet the *Women* ſtayed not behind but *crowded in with the men*, as *Theodorus Lector* reports it, πλεως ὁμοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἀνδρῶν ἅμα καὶ γυναικῶν, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ βασιλέως συναθροισθέντων i. Beſides *Athanaſius* here ſignifies the danger of a *crowd* was in the leſſer Churches, (not in this)

i *Collect. lib. 1.*

where they could not meet but ἐπὶ κινδύνου συνοχῆς, and so drefers their assembling together in the great Church as better.

As for the *Tumults* (which might have been concealed in a *Vindication of the primitive Church*) if there was any thing *tumultuous*, it was over when *Athanasius* had complyed with their desires to meet in the great Church. And so no apprehension of danger left to *women*, or any else, upon this account.

" And even those that did assemble there were too " many for one Congregation, and was an assembly " more for Solemnity and Ostentation than for Personal " Communion in Worship, and the proper ends of a " religious Assembly.

Here he runs as cross, to the great *Athanasius* and the account which he gives of this Assembly as if he had *studied it*, debasing that as more for *Ostentation* than for *Personal Communion* in Worship, and the *proper ends* of a *Religious Assembly*, which *Athanasius* highly commends both for the more desirable *communion* which the Christians had there in *Worship*, and for the greater efficacy of it as to *the proper ends of a Religious Assembly*. Let any one view the passages *k* and judge. He sets forth the *harmony*, and *concurrence* of *the multitude* in *worship with one voice*. He preferrs it before *their assemblies*, *when dispersed* in little places, and not only because *the unanimity* of *the multitude was herein more apparent*, but because God would sooner hear them, οὕτω καὶ ταχέως ὁ Θεὸς ἐπακούει. *For if*, sayes he, *according to our Saviour's promise*, *where two shall agree concerning any thing it shall be done for them by my Father*, &c. *how prevalent will be the one voice of so numerous a people*, *assembled together and saying Amen to God?* and more to that purpose, by which we may perceive, *Athanasius* being Judge, how true is it that this Assembly was more for

k *Apol.2.p.531. 532.*

Solemnity

Solemnity and Oſtentation, than for Perſonal Communion in Worſhip and *the proper ends of a Religious Aſſembly.* And thus much to let us ſee through the *Arts* uſed to cloud a clear paſſage alledged out of *Athanaſius*; if M. *B.* had betaken himſelf to ſuch *little deviſes*, in like Circumſtances; our *Author* would have taken the Liberty to tell him, that he was driven to hard Shifts.

Before we leave *Alexandria* I am to take notice of what is ſaid by our *Author*, to part of a Letter writ by a Friend to M. *B.* concerning this *City* and the number of Chriſtians therein in *Conſtantius* his time. The *Writer* of it obſerves a groſs abuſe put upon him in the *Vindicator*'s Anſwer to it, and deſires his defence may be here inſerted. It contains an argument to confirm what was concluded from that paſſage in *Athanaſius* here inſiſted on, that the Catholicks *then could meet in one place.* After that *paſſage* and to this purpoſe M. *B.* introduced it, as is very apparent *l.* This our *Author* ſeems to obſerve *when he begins* with it; *he adds*, ſayes he, *to this of* Athanaſius (the very paſſage mentioned) *another argument given him by a learned Friend m.* And *after* he hath done with it *n*, *becauſe M.* B. *has endeavoured to repreſent the Church of* Alexandria *ſo inconſiderable even in* Conſtantius *his dayes*, &c. And yet, how it comes to paſs I know not, it is quite out of his thoughts while he is examining it. He was ſo haſty for confuting, that he ſtaies not to take notice what he was to confute, though the intent of it be moſt plain and obvious, both by the *occaſion* and *words* of the *Letter*: But Forces that ſenſe on it, and makes that the deſign of it; which I was far from thinking, would ever come into any man's Fancy, when he was awake. The words of the Letter are theſe; *The City of* Alexandria, *ſayes* Strabo, *is like a Soldiers Cloak*, &c. *and by computation about ten miles in compaſs, a 3d. or 4th. part of this was taken up with publick*

l Church Hiſt. Pag. 9. 10.

m Pag. 58.

n Pag. 63.

publick buildings, Temples and Royal Palaces; thus it two miles and an half or three and a quarter taken up. He anſwers, "I will not ſay this *learned friend* hath impoſed "on M.*B.* but there is a very great miſtake betwixt them.

But the miſtake is his own, and ſuch a one, as I wonder how he could fall into it. He takes it for granted, that the Argument is brought to prove what Chriſtians *Alexandria* had in *Strabo*'s time. Here is not the leaſt occaſion given for this, unleſs the citing of *Strabo* ſhewing the dimenſions of that City: but *Primate Uſher* is quoted too, on the ſame account; and ſo as much reaſon to fancy the deſign was to ſhew what Chriſtians *Alexandria* had in the *Primate's time. Jerome, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen* are alſo cited there; why could not theſe as well lead him to the right Age, which their words plainly point at, without the leaſt glance at any Age before, as *Strabo* alone (cited without any reſpect to the time when he writ) ſo far miſlead him? Nay, the 4th. age is expreſly mentioned in the Letter; and the numerouſneſs of the *Novatians* and *Arians* in *Alexandria* at the time intended, is inſiſted on; could he think any man ſo ſtupid, that had but the leaſt acquaintance with thoſe things, as to ſpeak of *Arians*, and *Novatians* in *Strabo*'s time? But it may be, though I would hope better, our *Examiner* was too inclinable to fix an abſurd thing upon the *Writer* of the *Letter*; that he might be excuſed, from giving a better anſwer when it was not ready.

But let us hear what he ſayes to it; yet what can be expected to be ſaid by one who makes his own dream the Foundation of his Diſcourſe? However let us try if we can find any one clauſe that is *true and pertinent* in the whole, and begin with the beſt of it.

Though *Strabo* ſayes that Temples and great Palaces took up a 4th. or a 3d. of the City, yet our *Examiner* will

will have us think there might be inhabitants there; when *Epiphanius* ſayes, as I cited him, that part was ἔρημος, deſtitute of Inhabitants, ſo he tells us *Bruchium* was. The Examiner denies not *Bruchium* to be that Region of the City which *Strabo* ſayes, *was taken up with Publick Buildings*, but adds, *what all the publick buildings of the Town in one Region?* But who ſaid *all* the Publick Buildings? This is his own fancy ſtill.

"And that an outer skirt too, as it is deſcribed by "the Greek *Martyrology* in *Hillarion*, &c.

If he mean it was not a Part or Region of the City *Strabo* and *Epiphanius* will have Credit before a *Story* out of the Greek *Martyrology*, or him that tells it, when it appears not in the words cited. In *Strabo* it is μέρος *part of the City*, in *Epiphanius* it is a *Region*, ἐν τῷ βρυχίῳ καλουμένῳ κλίματι. For as *Rome* was divided into 14 *Regions*, and *C. P.* in imitation of it, ſo *Alexandria* was divided into 5, whereof *Bruchium* was one, and the greateſt of all. So I underſtand *Ammianus Marcellinus*, who upon the loſs of *Bruchium* ſaith, *amiſit regionum maximam partem quæ Bruchium apellatur*; *Alexandria loſt the greateſt of its Regions, which was called* Bruchium.

de pond. ut mens p. 166.

"This *Epiphanius* ſayes was deſtitute of Inhabitants in "his time, and not unlikely, and perhaps deſtitute of "Publick Buildings too, for it was *deſtroyed* after an "obſtinate ſiege in the Reign of *Aurelian* as *Ammianus* "*Marcellinus*, or of *Claudius* as *Euſebius*.

When he hath granted all that I deſigned, *that this part was deſtitute of Inhabitants*, and more too, that it was *deſtroyed*, yet he would have the City *no leſs, no neceſſity of this*, ſayes he, ſure we are not yet awake? can a City looſe τέταρτον ἢ καὶ τρίτον τοῦ πάντος περιβόλου μέρος, in the *Hiſtorian's* words, a 4*th. yea, or a third part of its largeneſs*, and yet not be ſo *much the leſs?* He hath nothing to ſalve this, but it *may be*, and it *might be*, ground-

groundless surmises, without either reason or authority.

"They might inlarge upon another quarter, being it "may be forbid to build *Bruchium*—— they might "dwell closer than before, and so their multitude be un-"diminisht.

How far it is from being true, that *their multitude was undiminisht*; and *how needless either to inlarge— or to dwell closer*, may soon appear. The multitude must needs be much diminished in such a War, and a close siege of many years continuance, for so it is reported both by *Eusebius* and *Jerome*; and it was much wasted and in a consumptive condition, before it was thus besieged and dismantled by *Claudius* 2. or *Aurelian*.

in Chronic.

It was greatly diminished in numbers by *Caracalla* who Massacred a great part of the Inhabitants. *Herodian* sayes, τοσοῦτος ἐγένετο φόνος ὡς ῥείθροις αἵματος, &c. *the slaughter was such that with the streams of bloud, which ran from the place, not only the vastest outlets of* Nilus, *but the Sea, all along the Shore of* Alexandria *was discoloured o.* Towards the latter end of the third Age, *Dionysius* gives an account of the strange diminution of the *Alexandrians p*, signifying that in *former daies the elderly men were more numerous, than in his time, both young and old, comprizing all from infancy, to extream old age*, ἀπὸ νηπίων ἀρξαμένη παίδων, μέχρι τῶν εἰς ἄκρον γεγηρακότων.

o *Hist. Lib.* 4.

p *In Euseb. lib.* 7. *cap.* 22.

"However certain it is, that this City long after the "destruction of *Bruchium*, retained its ancient Great-"ness; and is represented by no Author as diminisht ei-"ther in Number or Wealth.

This is *certain* no otherwise than the former, *i.e.* quite the wrong way. For not long after the destruction of *Bruchium*, in the *Egyptian* War made by *Diocletian* upon *Achilleus*, which *Eusebius*, *Eutropius* and others mention: It was greatly *diminisht both in numbers and wealth.* For *Alexandria* after a long siege, was taken by force and

and plundred, great Execution done upon the Citizens, and the Walls of the Town demoliſhed.

A great part of the City (ſayes the Letter) *was aſſigned to the* Jews, *ſo* Strabo *indefinitely as* Joſephus *quotes him, others tell us more punctually, that their ſhare was two of the five diviſions; though many of them had their habitations in the other diviſions, yet they had two 5th. parts intire to themſelves; and this is I ſuppoſe the* ιδιον *which* Joſephus *ſayes the Succeſſors of* Alexander, *ſet apart for them; thus we ſee how 6 or 7 miles of the* 10 *are diſpoſed of.* To this he ſayes, "The number of thoſe "*Jews* was much leſſened within a little while after "*Strabo* by an inſurrection of the *Alexandrians* againſt "them.

I ſuppoſe he means by that ſlaughter of them which *Joſephus* mentions *q*, where 50000 were deſtroyed; but what were theſe to the vaſt number of *Jews* in *Egypt*, which *Philo r* ſayes amounted to no leſs than a million?

q De Bello Judaic. lib. 2. c. 21.

r Legat. ad Caium.

"The civil Wars afterwards under *Trajan* and his "Succeſſor had almoſt extirpated them.

It was in *Paleſtine* where theſe Tragedies were acted, and was ſo far from extinguiſhing them in *Egypt* or *Alexandria*, that thereby, in all probability; their numbers were there increaſed; for being diveſted of about 1000 Towns and Garriſons by *Severus* (*Adrian*'s General) as *Dion* reports, and forbidden all acceſs to *Jeruſalem* as *Ariſto Pelleus* in *Euſebius ſ*, this made other places more deſireable, thoſe particularly where they might have good entertainment as they were wont to have at *Alexandria*, and what *Dion Chryſoſtome* ſayes, confirms it.

ſ Lib. 4. cap. 6.

But all this which he ſayes, if there were *truth* in it, is impertinent; for the *Letter* is not concerned what *Jews* were there near *Strabo* or *Adrian*'s time, but in

the fourth Age. Yet *this is all* that he hath to say to the rest of the *Letter*, besides the publishing and repeating of his own mistake, and upon no other ground making himself sport with the Writer of it.

Thus he begins, *by the same rule he might have disposed of all at once, and concluded out of* Strabo's *division of the Town, that there was not one Christian in it*: and repeats it thrice in the same Page, *No matter what number of* Jews *or Heathens it had in* Strabo's *dayes*——, *it is kindly done to provide for Christians before they were in being, surely* Strabo, *who makes the distribution, never intended the Christians one foot of ground in all that division, and this learned Friend might have spared his little Town of* 8 *or* 10 *Furlongs, which he so liberally bestows upon the Bishop of* Alexandria, *before our Saviour was born*——, and he is at it again several times in the following discourse *t*.

t Pag. 69. 94.

How desirable a thing is it to have M. *B.* and *his Friend* render'd ridiculous? when rather than it shall not be done, our *Examiner* will publish his own indiscretion so many times over to effect it. But I will forbear any sharper reflections upon this *Author*, for taking him to be an ingenuous Person, I may expect he will be severe upon himself, when he discerns his errour; which I doubt not but he will see clearly by once more reading that Letter.

Next he would disprove M. *B*'s representation of the Church of *Alexandria* in *Constantius*'s time, by giving a view of that Churches greatness from the first Foundation of it *u*; which because it may concern the *Letter* duly understood, I shall take some notice of it very briefly. But there is something interposed, between this and the *Letter*, which requires some observance; there we may have an instance of this Gentleman's severity upon M. *B.* and how reasonable it is; "His remark, sayes he, "upon two Bishops living quietly in *Alexandria* is so "disinge-

u Pag. 61.

"disingenuous a suggestion, that he hath reason to be "asham'd of it.

But what is there in this so *disingenuous and shameful?* Does not *Epiphanius* say this, and our Examiner acknowledge it *b?* Ay, but M. *B.* means that there were not only two Bishops, but their *distinct Churches* in this City. Well, and does not *Epiphanius* give him sufficiground for it? Does he not tell us that *Meletius* made Bishops, who had their ἰδίας ἐκκλησίας in every place where he came? Does he not signifie that the *Meletians* in *Alexandria* had their *distinct Churches* or Meetings both in the time of *Alexander* and *Athanasius?* says he not particularly of *Meletius* that *being* familiar with *Alexander* he stayed long in that City, having ἰδίαν σύναξιν καθ' ἑαυτὸν *a distinct Meeting with those of his own Party?* Were there not innumerable Cities in that Age which had *two* Bishops and their Churches, some *three* or *four* at once (those of the *Arians*, the *Donatists*, the *Novatians*, the *Meletians*, &c. besides those who were styled *Catholicks*) Would this Gentleman take it well if M. *B.* should tell him, that he who denies this is disingenuous if he know it, and hath some reason to be ashamed if he know it not? Ay, but *Epiphanius* was deceived in this account of the *Meletians*, and mis-represents them. Indeed our *Examiner* makes as bold with *Epiphanius* (a Bishop of great Zeal and Holiness, a Metropolitan, a famous Writer (as he does with M. *B.* charging him with *much weakness* (as one easily imposed upon) *many oversights, gross mistakes, diverse absurd things, and such stories*, that he will scarce wish worse to his Adversary, than to believe him *c.* Nor does *Epiphanius* alone fall under his censure in his *Vindication of the Primitive* &c. Church (as he calls it) he goes near to *accuse more* particular Persons (Bishops amongst others) of eminency in the antient Church, than he *defends*; so that one

b *Pag.* 107.

c *Pag.* 112. 113.

may suspect his design was, not so much to defend *eminent Bishops*, as *great Bishopricks* such as the antient Church had none, and to run cross to M. *B.* more than to vindicate any.

d *Euseb.l.2 c.16* "In St. *Mark's* time *Alexandria* had several Churches, though but one Bishop, *&c d.*

What *Eusebius* sayes of Churches in *Alexandria* at that time, is grounded upon a mistake, as appears, because immediately after the words cited, he adds, *so great was the multitude of Beleivers at* Mark's *first attempt there, that* Philo *in his writings thought fit to give an account of them,* ὡς καὶ γραφῆς ἀξιῶσαι τὸν Φίλωνα. *Eusebius* conceived that the *Essenes*, as *Scaliger*, or the *Therapeutæ*, as *Valesius*, whom *Philo* describes, were the Christians of *Mark's* Conversion; and there being Assemblies of that Sect of the *Jews* in *Philo's* time, the Historian speaks of Christian Churches at *Alexandria* in *Mark's* time; but those who believe that he erred in the former, can have no reason to give him credit in the latter. Our *Examiner* does not deny that he was mistaken, but sayes, *it is not material whether they were Jews or Christians*; yet those who inquire after Truth sincerely, will think it *material*; and little value a Testimony which hath no better ground than a mistake.

e *Pag. 62.* The next is no better *e*, that is an Epistle of *Adrian*, which others are puzzled to make sense of, or such sense as can have any appearance of Truth. That very passage in it, which is the only ground of our *Author's* Argument, himself acknowledges to be false; for he would shew the Christians in *Alexandria* to be numerous enough for his purpose, because it is there said that *some* (whom he takes to be Christians) did *force the Patriarch* (whoever he be) *to worship Christ*, and yet adds, *there is no doubt but Adrian does the Christians wrong in this point, for they never forced any to their Religion.*

Religion. Will he have us to rely upon reaſonings, which have no better Foundation, than what is *undoubtedly falſe* by his own Confeſſion? He ſayes alſo *it is not material to our purpoſe whether this Patriarch were Biſhop of* Alexandria, *or chief Governour of the Jews.* If ſo, then it is not *material* with this *Gentleman*, either to argue from that which is not true, or elſe from that which is nothing to his purpoſe. For if this Patriarch was the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, that they *forced* him to worſhip Chriſt, is *not true*, he did it of his own accord: and if it be not one, who was no Chriſtian, that they forced; then is not any thing in this paſſage to his purpoſe, and *Adrian*'s Epiſtle might have been waved as a meer impertinency.

That which follows *f*, hath not the ſhew of a reaſon, "the great Catechiſts of *Alexandria*, as *Pantenus*, *Cle-* "*mens*, *Origen* and *Heracles*, did not a little advance "the growth of Chriſtian Religion in that place, *&c.* f Pag. 63.

Muſt there needs be a *Dioceſan Church* there becauſe the *Catechiſts* did advance Religion not a little?

The next concerning *Dionyſius* his Church meeting at *Chebron* (*Cephro* it ſhould be) and *Coluthio*, is already fully anſwered, as it is offered with better improvement than our *Examiner* gives it *g*. It cannot eaſily be apprehended how a larger Church meeting with *Dionyſius*, made up of thoſe baniſhed with him, and others from ſeveral parts of *Egypt*, at *Cephro*, a Village in *Lybia*, a diſtinct Province; ſhould prove that he had a *Dioceſan* Church in *Alexandria*, to any, but thoſe who are very inclinable to believe it without proof. Nor will others underſtand that *Dionyſius* is better proved to be a Dioceſan by the Chriſtians which came from *Alexandria* to *Coluthio* in *Mareotes*; (there being none there beſides) for the Believers in *Alexandria* it ſelf, were no more than one Church could hold, as *Valeſius* collects from g No Evidence for pag. 35, 36.

from this very place to our *Examiners* regret, *Ex hoc loco colligitur, ætate quidem Dionysii, unicam adhuc fuisse Alexandriæ Ecclesiam, in quam omnes Urbis illius fideles, Orationis causâ, convenirent* h.

h *Not. in Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 11.*

In the next Paragraph our *Examiner* argues for the great numbers of Christians at *Alexandria*, from the multitude of Martyrs at *Thebes*.

"Under the Persecution of *Diocletian* what numbers "of Christians might be at *Alexandria*, may be judged "by the multitude of Martyrs that suffered at *Thebes* i, "&c.

i *Pag. 64.*

But here he mistakes *Eusebius*, who gives an account not of the Martyrs which were ἐν Θήβαις, in the *City Thebes*, but κατὰ Θηβαΐδα, the *Province Thebais*: which was half of that large Kingdom, according to the antient division of it into the *upper* and *lower Egypt*. The *Superiour Egypt* was *Thebais*, the *inferiour* was called sometimes the *Delta*, sometimes *Egypt* in a restrained sense, and this division in these terms we have in *Eusebius* (to go no further) a little before k, κατὰ Θηβαΐδα καὶ Αἴγυπτον, where he begins his account of the Martyrs in this Countrey. Now if the Christians in that Province of large extent, and comprising very many Cities may be concluded to be very numerous from the multitudes of Martyrs which suffered there; yet nothing at all can be inferred for any numbers to his purpose in the City *Thebes*, by which he would conclude their numerousness in *Alexandria*. But if M. *B.* had mistaken one City for so large a Countrey with multitudes of Cities in it, and made that mistake the ground of his reasoning; it is like our *Examiner* would have exposed him for it in his *Preface*, as he does for some lesser matters.

k *Cap. 6.*

In the following Paragraph l, there is a groundless supposition, that the division of *Alexandria into Parishes was antienter than Arius*, there being no mention of it

l *Pag. 65.*

by

by any antient Author: as also an accusation of *Petavius* as mistaking *Epiphanius* his words, without any cause that I can discern in those words, though he sayes, *it is plain* there. That which he sayes is plain, the learned Dean of *Paul's* could not discern, but understood *Epiphanius* as *Petavius* and others did before him. These I took to be preliminaries and expected his Argument, but found it not, unless it be couched in the first words. Sum. of Separation p. 28.

"The Division of *Alexandria* between several Presbyters, as it were into so many Parishes, *&c.*

But this signifies nothing for his purpose, if those in *Alexandria* thus divided could all meet in one place, as *Athanasius* declares they did; and that so plainly that any one will judge so, whose interest is not too hard for his judgment. *Valesius* (who had no byas unless what might lead him the other way) understood it as I do; and expresses it in these words. (deciding the matter so long insisted on, against our Author) *Afterwards in the times of* Athanasius, *when there were more Churches built by diverse Bishops of* Alexandria, *the Citizens assembled in several Churches severally and in parcels, as* Athanasius *sayes in his Apology to* Constantius; *but on the great Festivals, Easter and Pentecost, no particular assemblies were held,* sed universi in majorem Ecclesiam conveniebant, ut ibidem testatur Athanasius, *but all of them assembled together in the great Church as* Athanasius *testifies.*

So that there can be no pretence that the Church in *Alexandria* was *Diocesan* at this time, unless those who could meet together in one place might make such a Church. Yet this was then the greatest Church in the *Empire* save that at *Rome*, and what he adds makes that at *Rome* very unlike such *Diocesan* Churches as are now asserted.

* *Valesius*

"*Valesius* inferrs from the same passage of Pope *Inno-*
"*cent's* Epistle to *Decentius*, which *Petavius* brings to
"prove the contrary, that though there were several
"*Titles* or Churches in *Rome* then, and had been long
"before, yet none of them was as yet appropriated to
"any Presbyter, but they were served in common as
"great Cities in *Holland* and some other reformed
"Countreys, that have several Churches and Mini-
"sters, *&c.*

The Advocates for *these* Churches, who assign the bounds of a *Diocess* with most Moderation, will have it to comprize a City with a *Territory* belonging to it; but there was no Church in the Territory which belonged to the Bishop of *Rome*, he had none but within the City, as *Innocentius* declares in the cited Epistle, whereas now the greatest City with a Territory larger than some antient *Province* is counted little enough for a *Diocess*. Further it is now judged to be no Diocess which compriſes not very many Churches with Presbyters appropriated to them; but he tells us none of the Churches in *Rome* were appropriated to any Presbyter, but they were *served in common*. How? as greater Cities in *Holland* and some other reformed Countreys, and then they were ruled *in common* as these Cities are. The Government of many Churches is not there, nor was of old, ever entrusted in one hand; and thus the Bishop of *Rome* was no more a *Diocesan* than the Presbyters of that City.

m Pag. 66. He concludes *m* with two Assertions which will neither of them hold good. The first *that it is evident out of* Athanasius *how the Bishop of that City had from the beginning several fixed Congregations under him.*

This is so far from being *evident* in *Athanasius*, that he hath not one word which so much as intimates that the Bishop of *Alexandria from the beginning* had any such Congregations under him. The

The other is *that thoſe of Mareotes muſt be ſuppoſed to receive the faith almoſt as early as* Alexandria.

How true this is we may underſtand by *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* towards the latter end of the third Age, who declares that then *Mareotes* was ἔρημος ἀνδρῶν ἢ σπουδαίων ἀνθρώπων ἦν, it was ſo far from having any *true* Chriſtians in it, that it had none of our *Author's old Chriſtians*, i. e. *virtuous, good men* o. Nor is it likely that the faith was there generally received till many years after; and therefore not almoſt ſo early as *Alexandria*, unleſs the diſtance of above 200 years will conſiſt with his *almoſt*. For *Alexandria* received the Faith by the preaching of *Mark*, who arrived there, ſayes *Euſebius*, in the 2d. of *Claudius* p, others in the 3d. of *Caligula* q. But in the time of *Dionyſius* it doth not appear that *Mareotes* had ſo many Chriſtians, as Biſhop *Iſchyras* his Church *there* conſiſted of, though thoſe were but ſeven, ὁ πλέον ἑπτὰ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἔχων r. But enough of *Alexandria*, though our *Author* is far from bringing enough to prove it even in the 4th. age a *Dioceſan* Church. He may be excuſed for doing his utmoſt to this purpoſe, conſidering the conſequence of it, for if this Church was not now ſo numerous as to be *Dioceſan*, it will be in vain to expect a diſcovery of any ſuch Churches in the whole Chriſtian World in thoſe times; for this is acknowledged to be the greateſt City and Church in the *Roman Empire* next to *Rome*. So that there cannot be ſo fair a pretence for any other inferiour to this, ſuch as *Jeruſalem*, *Carthage*, *Antioch*, &c. much leſs for ordinary Cities, which were 10 times leſs conſiderable than ſome of the former, as may be collected from what *Chryſoſtome* ſayes of one of them Ἓν πόλιν πέντε συνατὴν ὅλην θρέψαι, that it was able to maintain the poor of ten Cities ſ.

n *Euſeb. l.* 7. *c.* 11.

o *pag.* 60.

p *Chron. Euſeb.*

q *Chron. Alex.*

r *Athan. Apol.* 2. *pag.* 615.

ſ *In Mat. Hom.* ξοϛ.

So far the Writer of the Letter. Let me now return to our *Author's Preface*; To ſhew that the Chriſtians

in *Alexandria* adhereing to *Athanasius* were not so exceeding numerous as is pretended, and not to be compared with the Christians now in *London*, I had said, *that the greatest part of the Inhabitants of that City were at this time Heathens or* Jews; *of those who passed for Christians, it is like* Athanasius *had the lesser share* u, *the* Novatians *and other Sects, the* Meletians *especially, and the* Arians, *did probably exceed his flock in numbers, it may be the* Arians *there were more numerous.* This last clause (which appears by the expression, I was not positive in) he alone fixes on, and would disprove it by a passage out of *Athanasius*. But the Greek is false printed, and and the sense defective for want of some word, and so no Judgment can be well passed thereon, unless I saw it; and where to see it he gives no direction. My concern therein is not so great as to search for it through so voluminous an Author. It will serve my turn well enough, if the *Arians* were but very numerous, or as *Sozomen* expresses them, οὐκ ὀλίγη μοῖρα τοῦ λαοῦ w, which cannot be denied, though they *alone* were not more numerous. The last thing he would take notice of, is the Diocess of *Theodoret*, but this is remitted to the *Dean of* Paul's, yet one thing he sayes he cannot omit; though some may think that he had better have passed it (as he had many other things); than being so much in haste, to slip at almost every line, as he does in those few which concern it.

u Pag. 34.

w Lib. 1. c. 14.

If these 800 *Churches, not* 80 *as this Gentleman reckons them* (it was not he but the *Printer* that so reckoned them, as the *Errata* shew) *belonged to him as Metropolitan, and they were all Episcopal Churches* (I never met with any before, that took them for *Episcopal Churches*, and how he should fall into this mistake I cannot imagine; I will not believe that he creates it, to make himself work) *this poor Region of* Cyrus *would have more*

Bishops

Biſhops than all Africa (not ſo neither, for by the *conference at* Carthage, and the *abbreviation* of it by St. *Auſtin*, much more to be relyed on, than the *Notitia* publiſhed by *Simond*, which is neither conſiſtent with others, nor with it ſelf, *Africa* had many more Biſhops than 800) *notwithſtanding they were more numerous there than in any part of the World beſides.* Nor will this paſs for true with thoſe, who take his own account concerning their numbers in *Africa* (which he reckons but 466 taking in thoſe of the *Schiſmaticks* too; about 66 for each Province one with another, counting them as he does *ſeven*:) and the account which others give of their numbers, in the antient *Roman Province*, the *Kingdom of* Naples, the *Iſland Crete*, *Ireland*, to ſay nothing of *Armenia*, and other parts of the World. *Vindic. p. 149.*

That which follows, is I ſuppoſe, inſtead of an *Anſwer* to the *other part* of my *diſcourſe* concerning the *popular election* of Biſhops, which this *Gentleman* was as much concerned to take notice of, as of the few paſſages he hath touched in the *former part*, why he did not I will not enquire further, but ſatisfie my ſelf with what is obvious; eſpecially ſince he tells us he intends a diſcourſe of ſuch a Subject. If in this deſigned work he ſatisfies me, that it was not the *general practice of the antient Church, for the People to concur in the choice of their Biſhops*, he will do me a greater diſpleaſure, than the confutation of what I have writ, or any other that I can fear he intends me; by taking me off from further Converſation with *antient Authors*, as perſons by whoſe Writings we can *clearly* know nothing. For if *that point* be not *clear* in Antiquity. I can never expect to find any thing there that is ſo.

I intended to conclude this diſcourſe here, without giving the Reader further trouble; but conſidering there are miſapprehenſions about the Subject in que-

ſtion, thoſe being taken by diverſe, for *Dioceſan Churches* which indeed are not ſuch, and arguments uſed to prove them ſo which are not competent for that purpoſe, (of which there are many inſtances, as elſewhere ſo particularly in the latter end of this Authors diſcourſe): I thought it requiſite for the rectifying of theſe miſtakes, and to ſhew the inſufficiency or impertinency of ſuch reaſonings, to give an account what *mediums* cannot in reaſon be eſteemed, to afford competent proof of *Dioceſan Churches*.

In general, Thoſe who will ſatisfy us that any Churches, in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, were *Dioceſan*, ſhould prove them to be ſuch *Dioceſans* as ours are, as large or near as large; otherwiſe what they offer, will ſcarce appear to be pertinent. For the riſe of this debate is the queſtion between us, whether the Biſhops of theſe times be ſuch as thoſe in the *primitive* Church. This we deny, becauſe modern Biſhops will have *another ſort of Churches* or Dioceſes, than were known in the beſt Ages. Not that we reject all Dioceſes or Dioceſan Churches, for both παροικία and διοίκησις are uſed by the Antients for ſuch Churches as we allow. It is thoſe of a later Model, that we approve not, as vaſtly differing from the antient Epiſcopal Churches. The modern *Dioceſes*, and Churches thence denominated are exceeding great and extenſive, conſiſting of many ſcores, or many hundred particular Churches, whereas for the three firſt Ages we cannot find 3 Biſhops that had *two* particular Churches in his Dioceſs, nor in the 4th. one in 50 (if I may not ſay one in a hundred) that had *more*. So that the difference is exceeding great, and more conſiderable in the *conſequence* thereof, which I had rather give an account of in the words of the very learned D. *St.* than mine own. *Dioceſes generally*, ſayes he, *in the primitive, and Eaſtern Churches were very ſmall*

and

and little, as far more convenient for this end of them in the Government of the Church under the Biſhops charge x, and elſewhere, *Diſcipline,* ſayes he, *was then a great deal more ſtrict, Preaching more diligent, Men more apprehenſive of the weight of their Function, than for any to undertake ſuch a care and charge of Souls, that it was impoſſible for them even to know, obſerve or watch over, ſo as to give an account for them y, Men that were imployed in the Church then did not conſult for their eaſe and honour, and thought it not enough for them to ſit ſtill, and bid others work z.* St. *Auſtin* ſpeaking of the 3d. Age, makes account of *many thouſand Biſhops then in the World a.* Our *Author* ſeems to treat that excellent Perſon ſomething courſely on this occaſion, and goes near to queſtion his judgment or veracity for it, *b* ſome may think this not over decently done (to ſay no more) when it is his buſineſs, to vindicate ſome antient Biſhops who need it, to reflect upon one, ſo untainted, as to need none. However ſince he ſayes that *Father judged of other Ages by his own, when Dioceſes were exceedingly multiplyed c,* we may ſuppoſe he will grant there were *many thouſand Biſhops* in the 4th. Age. Yet among ſo many thouſand Biſhops I do not expect that any can ſhew me 20 (if I may not ſay 10.) who had ſo many Churches in their *Dioceſs,* as ſome *Pluraliſts* amongſt us may have, who yet never pretend to have a *Dioceſan Church.* Thoſe therefore who will make proof of ſuch *Dioceſan Churches* as are in queſtion, muſt ſhew us ſome in the *primitive times* ſomething like ours in largeneſs and extent. Amongſt the inſtances produced for this purpoſe by former or later Writers, I find none any thing near to ours, ſave that only of *Theodoret* in the 5th. Age. But this in the former Diſcourſe was ſhewed to be ſo inſufficient to ſerve the ends it is alledged for, that I may hope it will be preſt no more for this Service.

x Irn. p. 376.

y Pag. 332.

z Pag. 333.

a Contra Creſcon. lib. 3.

b Pag. 534.

c Pag. 535.

More

More particularly. 1ſt. It proves not a Church to be *Dioceſan* becauſe it conſiſts of more than can meet together in one place, for there are Pariſhes in this Land that contain many hundreds or thouſands more than can meet in the Pariſh Church, and yet are but counted ſingle Congregations. Though multitudes in ſuch Churches be far from proving them to be *Dioceſan*, yet I think *two* inſtances cannot be given in the third Age of more in one Church than are in ſome ſingle Congregations amongſt us; nor many afterwards, till *Arianiſm* and *Donatiſm* were ſuppreſſed; which the latter was not in *Africa* till after the famous Conference at *Carthage*, Anno 410; nor the former in other parts during the 4th. Age; for though *Theodoſius* made ſome ſharp Declarations againſt them and other Hereticks, yet none but the *Eunomians* were proſecuted, if we believe *Socrates* *d*; that Emperour gave not the leaſt trouble to the reſt, *forced none to communicate with him*, but allowed them *their Meetings*, and even in *C. P.* when afterwards the *Arians* divided among themſelves, each party had ſeveral Congregations in that City *e*; both that which adhered to *Marinus*, and that alſo which followed *Dorothius*, theſe keeping the Churches *which they had before* and the other erecting *new Churches*.

d Lib. 5. c. 20.

e Lib. 5. c. 23.

I know there are thoſe, who from ſome paſſages in *Tertullian* *f*, would infer that the Chriſtians in his time were the major part of the Inhabitants in all Cities, and ſo enough not only for vaſt Congregations, but for *Dioceſan Churches*. But *Tertullian* was a great Oratour and frequently uſes hyperbolical expreſſions, which ought not to be ſtreined. Such are thoſe inſiſted on, and by regular conſtruction they import no more than that the Chriſtians were very numerous in many parts of the Empire. Thoſe that will have them ſtreined, and underſtood

f Apol. c. 37. & ad Scapulam.

derſtood as they ſound, offer great injury to *Tertullian*, making him intend that which hath no warrant in any Records of Antiquity, Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, that I can meet with. Before they impoſe ſuch a ſenſe on him, they ought in reaſon to make it manifeſt, that the Chriſtians were the *major part* of the inhabitants in ſome conſiderable Cities at that time; when I believe they cannot produce *two* inſtances in the *whole* Empire, I never yet could meet with *one*.

Our *Author* from theſe Oratorical expreſſions ſticks not to conclude, that it is evident that the Chriſtians were the *major part every where, but in* Rome *more eminently ſo*, and Dr. *Downham* ſignifies that *Tertullian ſpeaks chiefly of the City of* Rome *g*, this Gentleman ſayes, *that by his account it is made very probable, that they were the better half of the* Roman *Empire*, and tells us, *it is certain that the number of Chriſtians at* Rome *was proportionably greater than in any part of the Empire*. Now how far the Chriſtians at *Rome* were from being the *major part* of the Inhabitants, we may judge by the vaſt diſproportion between the poor in the Church at *Rome*, and thoſe in the whole *City*. *Cornelius* near 50 years after *Tertullian* (when it was of more growth by half an Age) reckons the poor of his Church to be 1500; whereas out of *Suetonius* and others, the poorer ſorts of Citizens, *quæ à publico victitabat*, are computed to be 320000 *h*.

g *Defenct l.* 2. *c.* 5. *p.* 98.

pag. 54.

h *Lipſius de Mag. Rom. l.* 3. *cap.* 2.

Many take occaſion from the thouſands converted at *Jeruſalem*, Acts 2. and 4. to conclude the vaſt number of Chriſtians and exceeding largeneſs of Churches elſewhere. Our *Author* hath nothing from *Scripture* for Dioceſan Churches but this, which is conſiderable *i*; nor will this appear ſo, if but a ſmall part of thoſe thouſands can be counted inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, and ſo fixed in that Church. And this is as demonſtrable as

i Pag. 435, &c.

any

any thing of this nature can be. For this miraculous Converſion was at *Pentecoſt*, one of the three great *Feaſts*, when there was a vaſt concourſe of *Jews and Proſelytes from all parts* to that City: Theſe converted were not only Inhabitants of *Jeruſalem* but Forreigners; and in all reaſon *more* of theſe proportionably, as they exceeded the Inhabitants in number. And then thoſe of the City will ſcarce be a 20th part of the 5 or 8000 *Converts*. For the Forreigners that reſorted to *Jeruſalem* at theſe great Solemnities are reckoned to be three millions, ὑπὲρ ἐλάττους τριακοσίων μυριάδων [k], whereas the Inhabitants of that City were but about an 120000 πρὸς δισχιλίας μυριάδας, but of this elſewhere more fully.

k *Joſeph de Bel. Judaic. Lib. 2. cap. 24.*

The Author of the Vindication will not have ſo great a part of thoſe *Converts* to be *Strangers*, and to return home when the Feaſt was over, and aſſigns ſomething like reaſons for it.

"1ſt, That the Scripture gives no countenance to this "Conjecture, but ſayes all thoſe ſtrange Nations were "Inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, and the Original word in-"clines moſt on this ſide.

That he ſhould ſay the *Scripture gives no countenance to this*, is ſomething ſtrange. It is plain in Scripture, that God injoyned the Children of *Iſrael* to repair to *Jeruſalem* from all quarters of the Countrey where they dwelt thrice a year, for the obſervance of the three great *Feaſts*. And it is apparent alſo that they were wont to come up to *Jeruſalem* at thoſe Solemnities, both *Jews* and Proſelytes, διὰ τὸ πολὺ συνελήλυθέναι πάντας ἀεὶ φυλαὶ μὲν καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν *a*. And it is evident in that Chapter cited, *Acts* 2. The Feaſt of Pentecoſt being come, there was a reſort of Jews and Proſelytes from all thoſe parts of the World to this City. Ay, but the Scripture ſayes, *all thoſe Strange Nations were inhabitants of* Jeruſalem.

a *In Euſeb. l. 2. c. 23.*

He

He can't judge that the Scripture ſayes this, but upon a ſuppoſition that the word κατοικοῦντες, *Acts* 2. 5. can ſignify no other thing than *inhabitants*, but this is a miſtake, for the word denotes ſuch as *abide* in a place, not only as *inhabitants*, but as *ſtrangers* or Sojourners. Thus Dr. *Hammond* will have it tranſlated *abiding*, rather than dwelling *b*, *thoſe that were there as ſtrangers c*, and here expreſſes thoſe *abiding at* Jeruſalem, to be *Jews which came up to the Feaſt of the Paſſeover, and Proſelytes which had come from ſeveral Nations of all Quarters of the World.* Thus alſo Mr. *Mead d*, for *the word* κατοικοῦντες, ſaith he, *which I tranſlate ſojourning rather than dwelling (for ſo I underſtand it, that they were not proper dwellers, but ſuch as came to worſhip at* Jeruſalem *from thoſe far Countreys, at the Feaſt of the Paſſeover and Pentecoſt, and ſo had been continuing there ſome good time) it is true that in the uſual Greek,* οἰκέω and κατοικέω *ſignify a durable manſion, but with the Helleniſts in whoſe Dialect the Scripture ſpeaketh, they are uſed indifferently for a ſtay of a ſhorter or longer time, that is, for to ſojourn as well as to dwell, as theſe two examples out of the Septuagint will make manifeſt,* Gen. 27. 44. 1 Kings 17. 20. *there* κατοικῶν *is to ſojourn only. In a word* οἰκέω *and* κατοικέω *anſwer to the Hebrew Verb* יָשַׁב *which ſignifies any ſtay or remaining in a place.* *Grotius* ſaith it anſwers the Hebrew word which is render'd not only by κατοικῶν but παροικῶν, *&c.* adding, therefore it is not ſaid only of them *who had fixed their habitation, but of thoſe who were come to the City for the celebrating of the Paſſeover or Pentecoſt, ſtaying there for a while.* The beſt and moſt learned Expoſitors generally take it ſo in this place, as denoting, not *ſettled Inhabitants*, but ſuch as reſided there only for a time. Indeed when this Author would have the Scripture ſay all theſe *ſtrange Nations were inhabitants of* Jeruſalem, he makes it ſpeak things inconſiſtent.

b *In loc.*
c *In Act.* 10. 2.
d *In Exercit. in Act.* 2. 5.

For it is said *ver.* 9. they were κατοικοῦντες, *dwellers at Mesopotamia, Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia*, &c. by which must be understood, either that they were *inhabitants* or *Sojourners* in those Countreys; that they were now *Sojourners* there, no man will imagine, nor can any man be said to be actually a sojourner in a place where he is not, And if they were *inhabitants* of those Regions they could not be *inhabitants* of *Jerusalem*, unless they could be inhabitants of several distant Countreys at once. To the same purpose Mr. *Mead* e. οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν, *where note by the way, that* οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν *are comprehended in the number of those whom my Text saith were* κατοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, *which confirms my interpretation that* κατοικοῦντες *there signifies sojourning, and not dwelling; for that they could not be said to dwell in both places.*

e *Ibid.*

"2. *Suppose there were some of them strangers*, &c.

Suppose, sayes this Gentleman, there were some of them Strangers? but does any man that understands how or by whom those Feasts were celebrated, ever suppose that there were not very many thousands of *strangers*, such as were not Inhabitants, present at those Solemnities? *Josephus* (and *Eusebius* after him) sayes, there were *three millions* in the City at the Passover, and declares what course was taken to give *Cestius Gallus* a certain account of their numbers; but then they were all in a manner *strangers*, for he adds, πολὺ δ' ἂν τοῦτο πλῆθος ἔξωθεν συλλέγοντας, *this vast multitude consisted of Forreigners* f. Yet our Author goes on and confirms himself in the former mistake by another; the verse he cites to prove them fixed Inhabitants at *Jerusalem* is misunderstood, the words are προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ, which do not signifie any fixed abode in that place, but only their constancy or persevering in the duties mentioned while they were there. This is the use of the Expression in the

f *De bel. Jud. lib. 7. c. ult.*

the New Testament, *Col.* 4. 2. τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε, and so *Rom.* 12. 12. *Continuing in Prayer*, which they might do if they never had a fixed habitation, nor continued as inhabitants in any place. And thus the *Evangelist Luke* uses the phrase in this book of the *Acts c.* 1. *ver.* 14. *c.* 2. 46. *c.* 6. 4. But our Author I think will never find it used in this form for any settled or continued abode in a place, and had no reason to fancy it here.

He thinks it not probable *g that the zeal and devotion of those Converts would suffer them to leave the Apostles*, whereas it is certain that the Primitive Zeal and Devotion, though it crucified them to the World, yet heightened and improved a Christian care of their Families and the Souls of their Relatives and others. And their zeal for Christ, and love to Souls would hasten them homeward, that they migh acquaint their Families and others with *Christ* and the Doctrine of Salvation, as those dispersed from *Jerusalem* did, *ch.* 8. g *Pag.* 437.

The *five thousand* mention'd *chap.* 4. *ver.* 4. he will have to be a new accession to the three thousand before Converted, but should not have been so positive in it without reason. Those who are engaged in the same cause with him (besides many others) are not of his opinion herein, as they would have been if they had seen any ground for it. Dr. *Hammond h* takes the 5000 to be the number of the *Auditory*, not of the Converts, Bishop *Downham* ineludes the three thousand in those five *i*, and the *Dean of* Paul's makes account but of five thousand in all *k*. To me it is not material whether they were 5000 or 8000 or many more, seeing there was not the *twentieth part* of them other than Forreigners, and such as for any thing I can see or hear designed not to *dwell* at *Jerusalem*, and so intended not fix themselves in that particular Church. There can be no just reckoning of the numerousness of a Church, from h *In loc.* i *Defence l.* 2. *c.* 5. *pag.* 85. k *Serm. of Separation Pag.* 26.

an occaſional recourſe of ſtrangers, who inhabit remote parts or forreign Countreys.

If there had been more Chriſtians in the Church of *Jeruſalem* than could meet in one place, that would be no Evidence that it was a *Dioceſan* Church, whereas the whole is ſaid in the *Acts* to meet in one place *l*. He hath nothing to ſay againſt this which is conſiderable, but that the *all, may denote only thoſe that were preſent m*, and ſo the ſenſe will be, all that were in one place, were in one place, if this can pleaſe himſelf, I think it will ſatisfie none elſe. Let Dr. *Hammond* decide this buſineſs, for in ſuch a cauſe we may admit a Party to be Umpire *n*, *What follows*, ſaith he, *of the paucity of Believers, and their meeting in one place, is willingly granted by us. What they ſay of the point of time*, Acts 2. 41. *that believers were ſo numerous, that they could not conveniently meet in one place, this is contrary to the evidence of the Text, which ſaith expreſly* ver. 44. *that all the believers were* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, *which in the laſt Paragraph they interpreted meeting in one and the ſame place: the like might be ſaid of the other places*, Acts 4. 3. *and* 5. 14. *for certainly as yet, though the number of Believers increaſed, yet they were not diſtributed into ſeveral Congregations.*

l *Act.* 2. 44. 6. 2. &c.

m *Pag.* 441.

n *Anſwer to L. Miniſters. pag.* 78. 79.

Concerning the diſperſion, *Acts* 8. 1. *o* he tells us, "Though they are all ſaid to be ſcattered beſides the "Apoſtles, yet it cannot be underſtood of all the Be- "leivers.

o *P.* 442. 443.

No, but of the generality of them, all that could commodiouſly fly as ſtrangers might do. Nor muſt it be confined to *all the Officers* only, the generality of Expoſitors are miſ-repreſented if this be made their ſenſe, nor doth it appear that *Euſebius* ſo underſtood it, μαθηταὶ is uſed in *Scripture* and *other Writers*, and *Euſebius* himſelf, to denote Believers and not Officers only. As for the

the *time* of the diſperſion (though I need not inſiſt on it) probably it was nearer this *great Pentecoſt* than ſome would have it. On the firſt day of the week in the morning were the three thouſand converted, the next or (as ſome tell us) the ſame day afternoon, at the ninth hour *p*, the number of the Converts was increaſed to five thouſand. While this Sermon was preaching the Apoſtles are apprehended and committed to Cuſtody till the next morning. Another, it is like the day after, they are impriſoned, but enlarged by an Angel in the night, *chap.* 5. In or near that week were the ſeven Deacons choſen, preſently after the Diſciples were thus increaſed and the Apoſtles impriſoned and diſmiſſed. The expreſſion ſignifies it, *chap.* 6. 1. It is not ἐν ἐκείναις, in thoſe daies which may admit a latitude and ſome good diſtance of time, but ἐν ταύταις, in theſe dayes, which denotes the time inſtant, or that which immediately enſues, without the interpoſure of any ſuch diſtance. And ſo the phraſe is uſed by St. "*Luke* both in the Goſpel and in the *Acts*. It is Dr. "*Hammond*'s obſervation upon *Luk.* 1.39. The phraſe "ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις, in theſe dayes, ſaith he, hath for "moſt part a peculiar ſignification, differing from "ἐν ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, in thoſe daies. The latter ſignifies "an indefinite time, ſometimes a good way off, but the "former generally denotes a certain time then preſent, "inſtantly, then at that time; ſo here, that which is "ſaid of *Mary*'s going to *Elizabeth* was ſure immediate-"ly after the departing of the Angel from her, and "therefore it is ſaid ſhe roſe up μετὰ σπουδῆς, very haſtily, "ſo *ver.* 24. μετὰ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας, *i.e.* immediately *Eliza-*"*beth* conceived, ſo *chap.* 6. 12. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, *i. e.* then, at that point of time he went out to the Mountain. See *Chap.* 23. 7. *c.* 24. 18. *Acts* 1. 5. *c.* 11. 27. *and* 21. 15.

p D. L.

Imme-

Immediately [illegible] the choice of the Deacons, *Stephen* one of the [illegible] is apprehended ἅμα τῇ χειροτονίᾳ, *as soon as ever he was ordained, as if he had been ordained for this alone*, saith *Eusebius* (l.2. c. 1.) And at the same time the Persecution began which dispersed that Church. Whereas he saith, ' whatsoever numbers were forced away; it ' is likely they returned, if he understand it of the *strangers* driven from *Jerusalem*, that they returned to fix there, or otherwise than occasionally, it is no more likely nor will be sooner proved than what he asserts a little after (pag. 444.) viz. *that the empty Sepulcher preached with no less efficacy than the Apostles.*

This is enough to satisfy what our Author would draw out of Scripture concerning the Church of *Jerusalem.* After some trifling about Objections which he forms himself, and then makes sport with, he comes to prove that *Jerusalem* was a *Diocesan* Church in the Apostles time. But first he would have us believe that *James was the proper Bishop of that Church*, and would evince it by two Testimonies, that of *Clemens* and *Hegesippus.* But what sayes his *Clemens?* He saith not only *that* James *was ordained Bishop of* Jerusalem *presently after our Saviour's Ascension*, but what I think our Author was loth to mention. If he had given us the intire sentence it might have been better understood. *After the Ascension of our Saviour*, Peter, James *and* John, *the most honoured by our Lord, would not yet contend for the first degree of honour*, μὴ ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης, *but chose* James *the just Bishop of* Jerusalem, *Apostolorum Episcopum. Ruffinus* reads it, This seems to signify that his being made a Bishop there, was some degree of Honour above their being Apostles. A learned *Romanist* tells us *q*, that the books where *Eusebius* had this did so abound with Errours, that they were not thought

q Valez.

worth

worth preserving, and so are lost (as those of *Papias* and *Hegisippus* are for the same reason) this may prove *one* instance of those many Errours. That which seems to be the sense of his words is more fully expressed by one who goes under the name of *Clemens* too *r*, *James the Lord's Brother was Prince of Bishops, and by his Episcopal Authority commanded all the Apostles*, and so the former *Clemens* in *Ruffinus* calls him *the Bishop of the Apostles s*. If he means such a Bishop as ours (and otherwise his meaning will not serve our Authors purpose) then the *Apostles* were but the *Vicars* or *Curates* of *James*. This is bad enough if *James* was an *Apostle*, the absurdest Papist will scarce ascribe as much to *Peter*. But if he was not an Apostle, it is yet more intolerable. If our Author can believe his own Witness, some may admire, but I think few will follow him.

r l.2. Recognit.

s Hist. l.3.c.2.

Let us hear *Hegesippus* (not quite so antient as this Gentleman makes him, since he was alive in the Reign of *Commodus*) he sayes, *James* ruled that Church μετὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων. If we take this as it is render'd in *Jerome after the Apostles*, it is not only against *Grammar*, but without Truth, and makes *James* to be Bishop when he was dead, for he was martyred about the 4th. of *Nero*, and all the Apostles but the other *James* survived him. But if the meaning be that he ruled that Church *with the Apostles*, it speaks him no more the Bishop of *Jerusalem* than the rest of the Apostles, who were not fixed or *topical* Bishops, but Oecumenical Officers of an *extraordinary* Office and Power and accordingly is *James* described. One antient Author sayes that he no less than *Peter* did ἐπιτροπὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀναδέξασθαι. And *Epiphanius* reports *t*, that *Hyginus* after *James*, *Peter* and *Paul was the ninth Bishop of* Rome successively, signifying that he was as much Bishop of

t Heres. Cerdon.

Rome

Rome as *Paul* and *Peter*. I need not quote that other Author who sayes *he ruled the holy Church of the* Hebrews, *as also he did all Churches every where founded* u.

u Ep. to James.

"However certain it is that *James* was Bishop of *Je-*
"*rusalem*, not only from *Hegisippus* and *Clemens Alex.*
"but also from St. *Paul*, who mentions him as one of
"the *Apostles* that he had Conversed with in *Jerusalem*,
"and it is likely there were no more there at that time
"but he and *Peter*.

This is no way certain from *Clemens* and *Hegesippus*, and so far from being *certain* by St. *Paul*, that his mentioning him as an *Apostle* makes it rather *certain* that he was not a Bishop; for the Offices of an *Apostle* and of a *Bishop* are inconsistent, as is acknowledged and proved by an excellent Person of your own. w "The Offices
"of an Apostle and of a Bishop are not in their nature
"well *consistent*, for the *Apostleship* is an extraordinary
"Office, charged with the instruction and Government
"of the whole World, and calling for an answerable
"care (the Apostles being Rulers, as St. *Chrysostom*
"saith, *ordained* by God, *Rulers not taking several Na-*
"*tions and Cities, but all of them in common intrusted*
"*with the whole world*) but *Episcopacy* is an ordinary
"standing charge affixed to one place, and requiring a
"special attendance there, Bishops being Pastors who,
"as *Chrysostome* saith, *do sit, and are imployed in one*
"*place*. Now he that hath such a general care can
"hardly discharge such a particular Office, and he that
"is fixed to so particular an attendance, can hardly look
"well after so general a charge, *&c.* *Baronius* saith of
"St. *Peter*, that *it was his Office not to stay in one place,*
"*but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over*
"*the whole world, and to bring those who did not yet believe*
"*to the Faith, and throughly to establish believers.* If so
"how could he be Bishop of *Rome*, which was an Office

w Dr. Barrow Suprem. p. 120, 121.

in-

" inconſiſtent with ſuch vagrancy. It would not have " beſeemed St. *Peter* the prime Apoſtle to aſſume the " charge of a particular Biſhop, it had been a degrada- " tion of himſelf, a diſparagement to the Apoſtolical " Majeſty for him to take upon him the Biſhoprick of " *Rome*, as if the *King* ſhould become Mayor of *London*, " as if the Biſhop of *London* ſhould be Vicar of *Pan-* " *cras*. And little before, St. *Peter's* being Biſhop of " *Rome* (*it holds as well of* James's *being Biſhop of* Jeruſa- " lem) would confound the Offices which God made di- " ſtinct, for God did appoint firſt Apoſtles, then Prophets, " then Paſtors and Teachers, wherefore St. *Peter* after he " was an *Apoſtle* could not well become a *Biſhop*, it would " be ſuch an irregularity as if a Biſhop ſhould be made a " Deacon.

" Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory makes *James* the ordinary Bi- " ſhop and *Dioceſan* of the place.

There is nothing in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory for it, but what is derived from *Hegeſippus* and *Clemens*, whom others followed right or wrong.

" It is ſtrange to ſee *Salmaſius* run his head ſo vio- " lently againſt ſuch ſolid Teſtimonies as thoſe of *Hege-* " *ſippus* and *Clemens*.

That great perſon underſtood things better, and diſcerned no danger in *running his head* againſt a ſhadow, and there is nothing more of Solidity in what is alledged from thoſe Authors.

Further he would prove it a *Dioceſan* Church by a paſſage in *Hegeſippus*, who ſayes, " that ſeveral of the " *Jewiſh* Sectaries who beleived neither a Reſurrection " nor Judgment to come, were Converted by *James*, " and that when a great number of the Rulers and " principal men of the City were by this Miniſtry " brought to believe the Goſpel, the *Jews* made an " Uproar, the Scribes and Phariſees ſaying, that it was

"to be feared that all the people would turn Christians x.

x Pag. 446.

He sayes many of the *prime Sectaries* were converted by *James*, but this will scarce prove such a *Diocesan* Church as he contends for. That which would serve his turn (*that all the people would turn Christians*) was not *effected*, but only *feared* by the *Jews*, who took a course to prevent it by killing *James*. But if this were for his purpose, *Hegesippus* is not an Author to be relied on, part of the Sentence cited is false, *that the Sects mentioned* (and he had mentioned seven) *did not believe the Resurrection nor Judgment*, whereas the Pharisees and others of them beleived both, which *Valesius* observes. One false thing in a Testimony is enough to render it suspected, but there are near twenty things false or fabulous in this account he gives of *James*, many of them marked by *Scaliger* y, divers by *Valesius* z, and some acknowledged by *Petavius* a.

In Euseb. 2. c. 23.

y Animad. in Euseb. p. 178.

z In Euseb. l. 2. cap. 23.

a Not. ad Heres 78.

He would not have us suspect that the numbers of the Church at *Jerusalem* were not so great as he pretends, because *Pella*, an obscure little Town, could receive them all besides its own Inhabitants, "but we must understand that Town to be their *Metropolis*, and the "Believers all scattered through the whole Countrey, "and this as *Epiphanius* writes.

But where does *Epiphanius* write this? Not in the place cited, he writes the contrary both there and elsewhere, that *all the Believers* (in one place b) that *all the Disciples* (in another place) πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔκεισαν ἐν Πέλλῃ c, what he adds is but to describe where the Town was situated, all *the Disciples*, *all the Believers* dwelt beyond *Jordan* in *Pella*. Archbishop *Whitgift* brings this as a pregnant proof that the Christians at *Jerusalem* were but few in comparison (and no more than could all meet *in one place*, as a little before he affirms

b Epiph. Her. 30.

c De Ponder. & Mens. cap. 15.

firms again and again) his words are how few Chri-
"stians was there at *Jerusalem* not long before it was de-
"stroyed, being above Forty years after Christ? Does
"not *Eusebius* testifie *d* that they all were received into a
"little Town called *Pella*? yet the Apostles had spent
"much time and labour in Preaching there; but the
"number of those that did not profess Christ in that
"City was infinite *e*. This might be farther cleared by
what *Epiphanius* saith of that Church in its return from
Pella, but I design briefness.

d Lib. 3. cap. 5.

e Defence of Answer. Treat. 3. c. 6. pag. 175.

Our Author adds one Testimony more, to shew that under the Government of *Simeon* great numbers were "added to that Church, many thousands of the Cir-
"cumcision receiving the Christian Faith at that time,
"and among the rest *Justus*, &c. *pag.* 448.

But those who view the place in *Eusebius* will see, that he does not say those many of the Circumcision were converted by *Simeon*, or were *under his Government*, or belonged to that Church; and so it signifies nothing for his purpose. And so in fine, the account wherewith he concludes his Discourse of *Jerusalem* will not be admitted by any who impartially consider the Premisses.

As for his other Scripture instances, there is not so much as the shadow of a proof shewed by him, that there were near so many Christians as in *Jerusalem*, or as are in some one of our Parishes, yea, or more than could meet in one place, either in *Samaria* (where he sayes it *appears not what kind of Government was established*, *pag.* 451.) or in *Lydda*, which was but a Village, though a fair one, and far from having *Saron* for its proper Territory, that being a plain between *Joppa* and *Cesarea*; or in *Antioch*, *pag.* 452. much less in *Corinth* and *Ephesus* which he advisedly passes by, *pag.* 456.

Our Author does in effect acknowledge that in Scripture it appears not that these Churches were *Episcopal*, much less *Diocesan*; "It is to be confessed, saies he, "*pag.* 461. that the Scriptures have not left so full and "perfect an account of the Constitution and Govern-"ment of the *first* Churches, *&c.* Thus we have no "more notice of the Churches of *Samaria* and of *Judæa* "(*Jerusalem* excepted) than that such were founded by "the Apostles; but of their *Government* and *Constitution* "we have not the least Information. What *information* then can we have that they were *Diocesan* or *Episcopal*? He goes on, "And the prospect left of *Antioch* in Scrip-"ture is very confused, as of a Church in *fieri*, where a "great number of eminent persons laboured together "to the building of it up; but only from *Ecclesiastical* "Writers, who report that this Church, when it was "settled and digested, was committed to the Govern-"ment of *Euodius*, and after him to *Ignatius*, *&c.* So that after what form the Church at *Antioch* was constituted does not appear (it may be Congregational and not Diocesan, for any thing this Gentleman can see in Scripture) but only from Ecclesiastical Writers.

But his *Ecclesiastical Writers* do so contradict one another as renders their testimonies of little value. Nor is there much more reckoning to be made of the *traditional* account they and others give concerning the Succession and Government of the first Bishops, than this Author makes of *Eusebius* his *traditional* Chronology, *pag.* 454. Some make *Euodias* the first Bishop and he being dead *Ignatius* to succeed him *f*; on the contrary some will have *Ignatius* to have been the first, and make no mention of *Euodius g*; others will have them to have governed that Church both together *h*; some will have *Euodius* ordained by *Peter*, and *Ignatius* by *Paul*, others report *Ignatius* ordained by *Peter*, and some modern

f Euseb. l. 3. c. 22.

g Chrys. Orat. in Ignat.

h Clemens Constitut. l. 7. c. 46.

dern Authors of great eminency, both Proteſtants and Papiſts (not only *Baronius* but Dr. *Hammond*) find no more tolerable way to reconcile them, than by aſſerting that there were more Biſhops than one there at once, which quite blaſts the conceit of a *Dioceſan* Church there.

And what is alledged for the numbers of Chriſtians there, to ſupport this conceit of a *Dioceſan* Church, is very feeble, *pag.* 452, 453. *A great number believed*, *Acts* 11. 21. and *much people*, *ver.* 24. The next verſes ſhew, that there were no more than *Paul* and *Barnabas* aſſembled within one Church; meeting ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, for a year together, and there taught this ἱκανὸν οἱ πολὺν ὄχλον. The ſame divine Author ſayes, *Acts* 6. 7. πολὺς ὄχλος, *a great Company of the Prieſts were converted*, and will this Gentleman hence conclude that there were Prieſts enough converted to make a *Dioceſe*?

He hath no ground from Scripture to think otherwiſe of *Rome* (that we may take in all his Scripture inſtances together) however he would perſwade us that there were ſeveral Congregations there in the Apoſtles times. Let us ſee how. "By the multitude of "Salutations in the end of that Epiſtle he makes appear "the numbers of Chriſtians in that City. Salute *Priſ*"*cilla* and *Aquila* with the Church that is in their "houſe.

The *Dean of Pauls* will have this Church in their houſe to be but a *Family*, this Author will have it to be a *Congregation*, as if it might be either to ſerve a turn. I think it was ſuch a Congregation as removed with *Aquila* from one Countrey to another, for this Church which was in their houſe at *Epheſus* before, (1 *Cor* 16.) is ſaid to be in their houſe at *Rome*, *Rom.* 16. that is, there were ſome of the Church which belonged to their Family.

Family. It is a queſtion whether there was now at *Rome* any one Congregation ſuch as our Author intends, *Grotius* [1] thinks it probable *there was none at all.* But let us ſuppoſe this to be a Congregation, where finds he his ſeveral others? why where another perſon would ſcarce dream of any? "It is not improbable, ſaith he, "that ſeveral that are mentioned with all *the Saints that* "*are with* them, may be the Officers of ſeveral Congre- "gations, *pag.* 457. 458.

[1] *In Rom.* 16.

But it is manifeſt that in the Apoſtle's times one Congregation had many Officers, how then can ſeveral Officers be a good Medium to prove ſeveral Congregations? The antient Authors which count thoſe Officers (mentioned *Rom.* 16.) do make them *Biſhops* (and ſome except not *Narciſſus* nor *Priſca*, i. e. *Priſcilla*, tho' her Husband alſo hath an Epiſcopal Chair aſſigned him) Now if they were not Biſhops at *Rome* but other places, they are alledged to no purpoſe; if they were Biſhops at *Rome*, there will be very *many* Biſhops in that *one* Church (it may be more than *Priſcilla*'s Congregation conſiſted of) which rather than our Author will grant, I ſuppoſe he will quit his plurality of Congregations here. Indeed what he adds next doth no waies favour them, and this number was afterwards in- "creaſed conſiderably by the coming of *Paul*, who con- "verted ſome of the *Jews*, and afterwards received all "that came, whether Jew's or Gentiles, and preached "to them the Kingdom of God for the ſpace of two "whole years, no man forbidding him, *pag.* 458.

Paul preached at *Rome* in *his hired houſe for two years*, all this while he received *all that came* to him; there is no queſtion but that all the Chriſtians there did come to hear this moſt eminent Apoſtle: ſo that it ſeems from firſt to laſt there were no more Chriſtians at *Rome* than a private Houſe could receive.

He

He would prove what he intends from *Nero*'s Per-
" ſecution, who is ſaid to have put an infinite multitude
" of Chriſtians to death upon pretence that they had
" fired *Rome*, pag. 458. *Tacitus* ſpeaks of the Chriſti-
" ans as guilty, and ſayes they confeſſed the Crime, and
" detected many others.

Now thoſe who ſuffered, either confeſſed that they fired *Rome* and then they were no Chriſtians; or they did not confeſs it, and then he wrongs them intolerably, and deſerves no credit. But our Author to excuſe him (againſt the ſenſe of ſuch who beſt underſtand him, *Lipſius* particularlay, beſides *Baronius* and others) ſayes, *they confeſſed not that they* burn't *Rome, but that they were Chriſtians*. Whereas the inquiry being concerning the burning of *Rome*, the queſtion was not whether they were *Chriſtians*, but whether they *fired* the City, of this laſt *Tacitus* ſpeaks, and will be ſo underſtood by thoſe who think he ſpeaks pertinently. But for truth in thoſe accounts he gives of Chriſtians, it is no more to be expected than from other Heathen Authors of thoſe Ages, with whom it is cuſtomary on that ſubject *ſplendidè mentiri*. Some other inſtances hereof we have in this report of *Tacitus*, which I ſuppoſe our Author will ſcarce offer to excuſe, as when the Chriſtian Religion is called *Exitiabilis ſuperſtitio*, and when the Chriſtians are ſaid *per flagitia invíſos vulgò fuiſſe*.

But ſuppoſe he ſpeaks truth, what is it he ſayes? Nero *put an infinite multitude of them to death*, but *ingens multitudo*, which are his words, may be far leſs than an *infinite multitude*. Two or three hundred may paſs for a great multitude, and extraordinarily great, when that which is ſpoke of them is extraordinary. The Martyrs burnt in Queen *Mary*'s dayes were a *great multitude*; and few may be accounted very many, to

ſuffer

suffer in such a manner, as these did by *Nero's* Cruelty, *Ferarum tergis contecti ut laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus affixi, aut flammandi, atque ubi defecisset dies in usum nocturni luminis uterentur*, in the words of *Tacitus*.

To this he adds the general account which *Eusebius* gives of the success of the Christian faith immediately after the first discovery of it, *that presently in all Cities and Villages Churches abounding with innumerable multitudes were assembled*, &c. *pag.* 459.

If he will not deal unkindly with *Eusebius* he must not set his expressions upon the Rack, nor stretch them beyond his intention, nor forget what is observed to be usual with him; *Oratorem more rem amplificare.* These Churches consisting of *innumerable multitudes* are said to be not only in *all* Cities, but *Villages*; now I believe it will be an hard matter for our Author to shew us any *Villages*, even in *Constantine's* time, where there were a Thousand, yea, or 500 Christians. Those who will not abuse themselves or their Readers must give great allowance to such expressions, and not rely on them in strict arguing.

And here it may not be amiss to take notice of what he sayes of *Rome* in another *Chapter*, M. *B.* had declared, *that he found no reason to believe that* Rome *and* Alexandria had for 200 years more Christians than some *London* Parishes (which have 60000 Souls) nor near, if half so many *k*. The chief, if not the only argument to prove them at *Rome* more numerous, is a passage in *Cornelius* his Epistle shewing the number of the Officers and of the poor, this was in the middle of the third Age, and so not within these 200 years, but yet proves not what it is alledged for in *Cornelius's* time, near *Anno* 360. The number of Officers signifies no such thing, as hath been made evident, the number of

k Church Hist. p. 7. Vindicat. p. 27.

the

the poor, being 1500 rather proves the contrary. This was cleared by comparing the proportions of the poor with the reſt in other places, at *Antioch* in particular, as was ſhewed out of *Chryſoſtome*, who reckons the poor to be a tenth part of the Inhabitants, and if it was ſo at *Rome* in *Cornelius*'s time, the Chriſtians were about 15000. This will ſerve M. *B*'s purpoſe well enough. But the time and circumſtances being exceeding different, makes it moſt probable that the Chriſtians then at *Rome* did nothing near ſo much exceed the poor in number. It is far more likely that the proportions were nearer that at *Conſtantinople*, where *Chryſoſtom* ſayes, the poor was *one half*, this would ſpoil all our Authors pretenſions, and ſo he adviſedly takes no notice of it.

However ſomething he would ſay againſt M. *B*. if one, could underſtand it. It is about the word θλιβόμενος in *Cornelius*'s Epiſtle render'd the *poor*. *Valeſius* obſerves the word is uſed by the *Roman Clergy* in an Epiſtle to thoſe at *Carthage*, *ſive Viduæ ſive Thlibomeni*, i. e. *indigentes*, ſaith he, as *Rufinus* tranſlates it, and tells us alſo that *Cyprian l* calls them *pauperes & indigentes qui laborant*. Theſe, ſayes our Author, were not only *poor*, *but ſick and diſeaſed*, alledging that of the *Roman Clergy* for it after *Valeſius*, and if he mean not only the poor, but the ſick alſo and the diſeaſed he is right, for *Cornelius* ſignifies thoſe that were maintained by the Church, Widows and Indigent whether ſick or well. But when he ſayes *theſe poor were ſuch only as were not able to come abroad*, he ſeems to confine it to the ſick and diſeaſed, and then it contradicts the former, and is without reaſon, againſt the uſe and import of the word, as render'd by all Interpreters former and later that I meet with, and indeed againſt common ſenſe; for the number *Cornelius* ſpeaks of is fixed, as that of the *Presbyters and Deacons*,

l Ep. 4.

ſuch as may be conſtantly known and a certain account given of it, whereas the number of the *ſick* is not fixed, but ſuch a contingency as is very uncertain and various.

But *Cornelius* ſayes in the ſame Epiſtle *that the people of his Church were innumerable.* True, that is, according to the frequent uſe of the word, very many (it is granted they were more than in any other Church) as when *Dio* ſayes the Nations conquered by *Trajan* were innumerable, and *Socrates* expreſſes thoſe wounded in the fight between the Chriſtians and Heathen in *Alexandria* about the demoliſhing of an Idol Temple were ἀναρίθμητοι *m*, which in *Sozomen* is but *many n*; and another *antient Author* ſayes there were *innumerable Biſhops in Africa*, which yet this Gentleman can eaſily *count*, and tells us that Schiſmaticks and all were but 466 *o*. M. *B.* may allow him what he falls ſhort in this reckoning, which is more than half, and may grant there were many more hundreds of Chriſtians in *Rome* than any of theſe *innumerables* come to, and yet make good what he ſuppoſes.

m Lib. 5. *c.* 15.
n Lib. 7. *c.* 15.
o Pag. 131.

The great liberality of the *Roman* Church is offered as no ſmall argument of its greatneſs, *they ſent to a great many Churches, relieving thoſe that were in want, and ſending neceſſaries to ſuch as were condemned to the Mines*; thus in *Severus*'s time, and in the time of *Dionyſius the Provinces of* Syria *with* Arabia *were thereby relieved every one, pag.* 53.

M. *B.* need not doubt, but ſome one Pariſh near him might do what is equivalent to this, if the antient Charity were revived, which opened the hearts of Chriſtians in thoſe times further than their Purſes could well extend.

But the words are odly ſtretched, for they did not relieve every one in all thoſe places, but ſuch as were *in great want*, and thoſe particularly who were *condemned*

to

to the Mines; and ἐπιχεῖν must denote as *it were the al-ſufficiency of the Roman Church*, which ſome would ſay is, *as it were Blaſphemy*, but our Author meant better, the proper import of the word is no more than *ſtipem conferre*.

He alledges two paſſages in *Euſebius* p, the *former* concerns not *Rome* more than any other place in the *Empire*, the import of it is this, not that every ſoul of every ſort, but that many of all ſorts were lead to the Chriſtian Religion, if πᾶσαν ψυχὴν be ſtretched to every ſoul *Euſebius* is made to ſpeak what is in a manner notoriouſly falſe, and monſtrouſly extravagant. The *later* which concerns *Rome* does but ſignify, *that more of Good quality for Riches and Birth with their Families and Relatives came over for Salvation* q. Theſe he will have to be of the *Nobility*, but thoſe were counted noble who deſcended from ſuch as had been Magiſtrates in Cities or free Towns. How this can make that Church near ſo great as our Author would have it, or greater than M. *B.* ſuppoſes, I don't underſtand.

p *Pag.* 54.

q *Lib.* 5. *c.* 21.

What he ſubjoyns is very ſurprizing and muſt ſeem ſtrange to thoſe who are acquainted with the ſtate of Church in thoſe times, *that the Chriſtians were the better half of the Roman Empire, that they were the major part every where, but in* Rome *more eminently*. This hath no good warrant from antient Authors, no, not from *Tertullian*, though he writ many years after *Commodus*. He like an Oratour *draws ſomething bigger than the life* (as our Author ſayes of *Nazianzen*, pag. 137.) and muſt have allowance on this account by thoſe who will not be injurious to him. In that very Age wherein *Commodus* reigned, it is ſaid *the Chriſtians were ſo often ſlaughtered that few could be found in* Rome *who profeſſed the name of Chriſt* r. And near 150 years after, when *Conſtantine* had reigned near 20 years in *Rome* the *gene-*

Pag. 54.

r *Platina vi Xyſti.*

rality of the Inhabitants shewed such disaffection to Christianity, as that is given for one reason why he transferred the seat of the Empire to *Byzantium* §.

§ Zosimus, Hist. l. 2. p. 61.

He runs beyond M. *B's* bounds towards the middle of the third Century, and tells us *the greatest part of* Alexander Severus *his Family were Christians*. And so they might be, and yet no more Christians in *Rome* for that, if they were Christians before they came into his family, which is more likely than that they were converted in it. However many more such Additions will not increase that Church beyond M. *B's* Measures, nor make it near so numerous as that Parish to which *Whitehall* belongs.

Pag. 55.

What he next offers neither concerns *Rome*, being general expressions, nor M. *B.* referring to the Ages after those which he is concerned for, whether by πολλὰς συναγωγὰς we understand the great multitudes which were gathered into the Christian Profession (as *Valesius*) or that assembled together for Christian worship (as our Author) is not material; though the former is more likely, unless we can think *Eusebius*, an elegant Writer, would use so much *tautology* in so few lines. That from which he may expect more service is the next expression, which he renders *the multitude of their Meetings in every City*, but may with better reason be render'd, the *numerousness or multitudes of those that assembled in several Cities*. For it is so far from being true, that every City had *many Congregations* of Christians in it; that there were many Cities long after, which had no Christians in them. And two instances cannot be given of any Cities in the whole Empire that at this time had more Congregations than one; unless where they all might have assembled in one place, they thought it better in Prudence to disperse themselves into several Meetings. For in *Alexandria*, which was the greatest City next to *Rome*,

Rome, and the moſt populous Church in the whole World, there is no appearance of more aſſemblies till the end of the tenth Perſecution, and the death of *Peter* Biſhop there, who ſuffered in the ninth year of it *t*. And therefore the *elegant gradation*, in diſcovering of which this Gentleman would have us take notice that he has a more comprehenſive faculty than *Valeſius*, ſeems not very well founded.

t Euſeb. l. 7. c. 32.

That which follows is an hundred years or more beyond the time to which M. *B.* limits his Aſſertion, "About this time or not long after *Rome* had above "40 Churches, which we muſt not imagine to be built "all at the ſame time, but by degrees, according as the "number of Believers did require; *&c. pag.* 55.

Pag. 55.

From the number of Churches he can't reaſonably conclude ſuch a multitude of Chriſtians as he contends for. There were many Churches in *Alexandria* when *Athanaſius* was Biſhop of it, and yet there were no more Chriſtians in his communion than could meet together in one place. *Baronius* tells us, that there was a City in *Germany which had* 400 *Churches in it*; and yet no reaſon to think that Town was comparable for Circuit and Populouſneſs, either to *Rome* or *Alexandria*. If I ſhould ſay that in *Optatus* there were not ſo many Churches, but the number miſtaken by the Tranſcribers, this would be as good an anſwer as that of our Author, who will have the 12 or 14 years of *Athanaſius* his Baniſhment in *Epiphanius* not to be ſo many moneths, and that years are put inſtead of moneths by the miſtake of the Copies, *pag.* 113. Or that other about the number of Biſhops in the Council at *Anticch*, where he will have 30 in diverſe Authors to be a miſtake of the Tranſcribers for, 90 (or 97 or 99. *u*) *Onuphrius* muſt have liked ſuch an Anſwer to this of *Optatus*, who tho' he was as much concerned for the greatneſs of the *Roman* Church

Anno 308. *n.* 2.

u pag. 123, 124, 125. *Interpret voc. Eccles.*

Church as any, and no leſs inquiſitive into the antient ſtate of it, yet delivers it as a thing manifeſt and certain, that *Rome* had but 28 *Titles*, and this number not compleated till the *fifth Age*. But there's no need to inſiſt on any thing of this nature, it is not ſo material how many Churches there was, as when there was ſo many, and about the time he will have *Blondel* to miſtake, and M. *B.* to follow him therein; he had been nibbling at *Blondell* a little before upon a ſmall occaſion and with as little reaſon, as might be ſhew'd, if it were fit to follow one in his Vagaries. Let us ſee whether here he doth not follow *Valeſius* in his miſtake, who will have *Optatus* to ſpeak of the Churches at *Rome* in the *time of* Diocletian's *Perſecution*, *tempore perſecutionis Diocletiani* w. But *Optatus* ſpeaks of thoſe Churches when extant and capable of receiving Congregation, as is plain by his words; but what Churches were at *Rome* or other places, in the very beginning of that Perſecution, were all quite demoliſhed, and that *in one day*, ſayes *Theodoret* x, or the *Paſchal dayes*, as *Euſebius* y; and there's no probability they could rebuild them while the Perſecution laſted, or that ſo many could be raiſed in leſs than many years after. *Nicephorus* ſpeaks but of 14 Churches at *Conſtantinople* in the reign of *Theodoſius* junior, nor meet I with any Author that gives an account of more, yet this was about an hundred years after *Byzantium* was re-edifyed, and both *Conſtantine* and the ſucceeding Emperours endeavoured to make that City as populous as could be, and furniſhed it with Churches anſwerable to the numbers of the Inhabitants. So that there's no likelihood there could be 40 Churches in *Rome* at any time nearer *Dioceſian's* than *Optatus's*.

w *In Euſeb. lib. 6. c. 43.*

x *Hiſt. l. 5. c. 38.*

y *Chron.*

v. 7. c. 49.

But to help this our Author tells us out of *Optatus*, that

that there were three *Donatiſts* Biſhops at *Rome* ſucceſſively before *Macrobius*, who was Contemporary with *Optatus*, and that the firſt of them was *Victor Garbienſis*, and he will have *Optatus* to ſpeak of the State of *Rome* (the 40 Churches there) not as it was in his own time, but in that of this *Victor*, when this was, he ſayes, is not eaſie to fix. *pag.* 56.

Yet this is certain, it cannot be in the time of *Diocleſian's Perſecution*, for the Schiſme of the *Donatiſts* did not break out till *Majorinus* was ordained (who was the firſt Biſhop of the Faction made in *Africa* or elſewhere) and this was ſometime after the Perſecution was there ended, as *Optatus* and *Valeſius* after him, and others declare z; and ſometime muſt be allowed after this for the *Donatiſts* ſettling in *Rome*, and ſuch an increaſe of them there as to need a Biſhop. *Baronius* makes this *Victor* to be Biſhop in *Silveſter's* time, which might be long enough after *Diocleſian's* Perſecution, for he lived till 335. All which our Author hath to alledge for the more early date of *Victor's* Biſhoprick, is that there were two or three Donatiſt Biſhops between *Victor* and *Optatus*; but this will ſcarce ſerve his turn. For there were four Biſhops of *Rome* in the former part of that very age wherein we are now concerned, who held not the Chair ten years among them, *Marcellus*, *Euſebius*, *Melchiades* and *Marcus*. But we may allow the three Donatiſt Biſhop at *Rome* near ten years a piece from the time of *Optatus*, 378 (as both *Blondel* and *Valeſius* agree) and yet *Victor Garbienſis* may not be Biſhop till *Anno* 350 and ſo nearer to *Optatus* his time, than *Diocleſians*.

z *De Schiſ. Donat. cap.* 3.

2dly, It is no proof of *Dioceſan* Churches that thoſe who belong to it, do occaſionally divide themſelves into diſtinct Meetings, A large Church, and ſometimes

times a ſmall Congregation may have occaſion to divide and meet in parcels for their convenience or ſecurity. Particularly in time of Perſecution, that they may aſſemble with more ſafety, and be the better concealed from thoſe who would diſturb or apprehend them. The people that belonged to *Cyprian* did meet all together on ſeveral occaſions, as is apparent in his *Epiſtles*; yet when Perſecution was hot, he thought it adviſable, *cautè non glomeratim nec per multitudinem ſimul junctam, conveniendum l*, they durſt not in ſome parts ὡς τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐκκλησιάζειν, in the beginning of *Conſtantine*'s Reign *m*.

l *Ep.* 5.
m *Soz. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

Damaſus, the ſuppoſed Author of the *Pope's lives*, ſayes, *Euariſtus Titulos Presbyteris diviſit, divided the Titles in* Rome *to the Presbyters*, and by *Titles* ſome will have us to underſtand *Pariſh* Churches. But it is incredible that the Chriſtians in *Trajan's* time when *Euariſtus* was Biſhop, could erect any ſtructures in form of Churches, or had any diſtinguiſhable from other houſes, ſo as the Heathen might take notice of them, as uſed or deſigned for the religious exerciſes of Chriſtians. Who can imagine that when it was death for any one to be known to be a Chriſtian, they ſhould frequent any *known* places for Chriſtian Worſhip? It is far more reaſonable which *Platina* ſayes of *Caliſtus's* time, more than an hundred years after, that then the *meeting of Chriſtians were all ſecret, and rather in Chappels, and thoſe hidden, and for the moſt part underground; than in open and publick places Cum eâ tempeſtate ob crebras perſecutiones occulta eſſent omnia, & ſacella potius, atque eadem abdita & plerumque ſubterranea; quam apertis in locis ac publicis fierent.* Dr. *St.* ſayes, *I confeſs it ſeems not probable to me that thoſe Tituli were ſo ſoon divided as the time of* Euariſtus, *who lived in the time of* Trajan, *when the Perſecution was hot againſt the Chriſtians*; but *Damaſus*

Iren. pag. 357.

ſeems

ſeems not to believe himſelf, for in the life of Dionyſius *he ſaith, Hic Presbyteris Eccleſias diviſit.* His reaſon concludes as much or more againſt the *Titles* under this notion aſcribed to *Marcellus* 200 years after (which ſome will have to be 25, but *Onuphrius* ſhews they could not be more than 15 *n*) for *Marcellus* was Biſhop of *Rome* for ſix years of the tenth Perſecution begun by *Diocleſian*, which was the longeſt and fierceſt that ever befel the Church; when the Chriſtians were ſo far from erecting any Churches, that all before erected were by ſevere Edicts to be quite demoliſhed. But what is ſaid of Titles divided by *Euariſtus* may be true in this ſenſe, that ſince they could not ſafely meet together in the Perſecution under *Trajan*, they diſperſed themſelves into diſtinct meetings, and had Presbyters aſſigned to officiate in each of them. And yet the Chriſtians at *Rome* were then no more, nor long after, than might all meet together for Worſhip, and did ſo when it could be done in ſafety. In the time of *Xyſtus* who had the Chair at *Rome* under *Adrian*, it is ſaid *becauſe of the frequent ſlaughters of the Chriſtians, there were few found who durſt profeſs the name of Chriſt, propter frequentes cædes pauci reperirentur qui nomen Chriſti profiteri auderent o.* And there was an order in that Church that *when the Biſhop celebrated, all the Presbyters ſhould be preſent.* Zepherinus *voluit Presbyteros omnes adeſſe celebrante Epiſcopo, quod etiam* Euariſto *placuit*, this is ſaid to be made in the time of *Euariſtus* to whom this diviſion of Titles is aſcribed, and it was in force an hundred years after, being renewed by *Zepherinus* who was Biſhop till *Anno* 218 about 30 years before *Cornelius*, who ſpeaks of 46. Presbyters at *Rome*. Now the Lords Supper was frequently adminiſtred in thoſe times, at leaſt every *Lords-day*, and when the Biſhop was preſent, he himſelf did celebrate, and if all the Presbyters

n *Interpret. Voc. Eccleſ.*

o *Platina.*

were to *be present when he did celebrate*, then all the People likewiſe were to be preſent, or elſe they had no Publick Worſhip, for they could have none without Biſhop or Presbyters.

3dly, A Church is not proved to be *Dioceſan* by the numbers of *Presbyters* in it, this I have made evident before, and made it good againſt our *Authors* exceptions. But he brings a new inſtance *p*, and will have *Edeſſa* to have been a *Dioceſan* Church becauſe of the numerous Clergy, the *Clergy*, ſayes he, *of the City of* Edeſſa *was above* 200 *perſons, not reckoning that of the Countrey within his Dioceſe, and this was a Dioceſan Biſhop to purpoſe.*

p *Pag.* 552.

He did well not to reckon that of the Countrey in his *Dioceſe*: unleſs he had kown that ſomething of the Countrey was within his Dioceſe. It was not unuſual for the Biſhops charge to be confined to a Town or City *Rome* it ſelf is an inſtance of it *q*, *Cum omnes Eccleſiæ noſtræ intra Civitatem conſtitutæ ſunt.* But why it ſhould be judged to be a *Dioceſan* Church becauſe 200 ſuch Perſons belonged to it, ſeeing the great Church at *C. P.* had above 500 Officers aſſigned it after *Juſtinian* had retrenched the numbers *r*, and yet was never couned a Dioceſe, I do not well underſtand. But he hath ſome other reaſons for it, and becauſe he thinks they prove the Biſhop of *Edeſſa* to have been *a Dioceſan to purpoſe*, let us on the by a little examine them; theſe he gives in ſummarily, *This was a Dioceſan Biſhop to purpoſe, who beſides a large Dioceſe, had excommunicating Archdeacons, and a great revenue.*

q *Innocent. Ep. ad Decentium.*

r *Novel.* 3. *c.* 3.

I find nothing alledged to ſhew he had a large *Dioceſe* or any at all, but this, *the City of* Battina was in the *Dioceſe of* Edeſſa, for *Ibas* is *accuſed of having endeavoured to make one* John Biſhop *of it*, &c.

Battina

Battina had a Bishop of its own, how then can it be said to be in the *Diocese* of *Edessa*, unless Province and Diocese be confounded? *Edessa* was the *Metropolis* of *Mesopotamia*, the Bishop of it was the third *Metropolitan* in the *Patriarchate* of *Antioch*, as they are ordered in the antient *Notitia*. The Bishop of *Battina* was one of the many *Suffragans* belonging to that *Metropolitan*. How then comes the Diocese of *Edessa* to be any wayes large upon this account? Is the *Diocese* of *Canterbury* one foot the larger, because there is a Bishop of *Peterborough* in that *Province*? These things are not easily apprehended nor can be well digested.

2dly, The *greatness of his Revenue* is no more apparent, there is nothing to prove it but the *riches of that Church*, and its great Revenues, and hereof our *Author* gives us no clear account, no value of the *Numismata*, nor is there any Evidence in the *Council* for the *Mannors* he speaks of but only the *felling of some wood* in a certain place there named. But where there was a *Diocesan* and *Archdeacons*, *decorum* required there should be *Mannors* and vast Revenues for the Bishop. Nor do I quarrel with it, only this breaks the squares a little, and disturbs the correspondence between those and our times; that if the Revenues of that Church had amounted to ten times more, yet the Bishop would scarce have been one jot the *richer* for it. This will not seem strange to any, who take notice of the antient Orders, concerning the revenues of an Episcopal Church. The Bishop was to have *nothing* thereof if he could maintain himself otherwise. When he was necessitous, nothing was allowed him for himself but *necessaries*, *food and raiment* [s]. He was to *purchase* nothing while he lived, nor to leave any thing got by his Bishoprick when he died, to his Relatives or others, but only to the Church that maintained him [t]. The Bishop of

[s] Con. Antioch. c. 25.
[t] Code Justin. Lex 42. Sect. 2. c. de Episc. Nov. 131. c. 13. Con. Car. 3. Can. 49.

Edeſſa, or any other in theſe Circumſtances, muſt be a poor *Dioceſan*, and one in a good *Engliſh Rectory* or *Vicaridge*, is in a fairer way to be rich, than any in the antient Biſhopricks, ſo ordered. And if Riches or Revenues be good Arguments to prove a *Dioceſan*, one of our Vicars may be a better *Dioceſan* than the Biſhop of *Edeſſa*. It is true there is ſome intimation from *Rome*, that the Biſhop ſhould have *the 4th. part* of the Churches revenues, but there's no appearance of ſuch a *diſtribution*, till after the time of the four firſt general Councils; nor in any Countrey but *Italy* till an hundred years after: Nor did it ever obtain (that I can diſcover after ſome inquiry) in the *Greek* Churches.

3. The other proof that *Ibas* was a *Dioceſan*, viz. *becauſe he had excommunicating Archdeacons*, our *Author* would make good by telling us, *that one of his Archdeacons excommunicated* Maras. Now this though it prove not what it is alledged for, may prove more than he likes. An *Archdeacon* in the antient Church (though he be another thing now) was not ſo much as a *Presbyter*, he was but in the lower Order of *Deacons*, though chief amongſt them, and choſen by them, as *Jerome* ſignifies *u*, *Diaconi eligunt de ſe quem induſtrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocant*, the *Deacons chuſe from amongſt themſelves one whom they know to be induſtrious, and call him Archdeacon*. Now if a Deacon had the *power* to *excommunicate*, there can be no doubt but the *Presbyters* had it, being of a Superiour Order and Power. And excommunication being counted the higheſt act of Juriſdiction, it cannot be queſtioned but the other acts thereof belonged to them; and ſo the *Presbyters* having all the Juriſdiction of *Biſhops* (all the power of Government) what did they want of being Biſhops but the honour of preſiding in their Aſſemblies?

u Ep. ad Evagrium.

And

And if they were no farther from being Bishops, they will go near to be as much *Diocesan*, and so this *Gentleman* may chuse, whether he will have *all* of both sorts to be *Diocesans*, or *none* of either.

4ly, It is no Argument to prove a Diocesan Church to shew that it consists of such who live at a good distance one from another. *Dionysius* had a great Congregation at *Cephro*, a Village in *Lybia*, but those which made up this Church were of another Countrey, coming partly from *Alexandria*, partly from other parts of *Egypt*, as *Eusebius* shews us, yet none ever esteemed that to be a *Diocesan Church*. In *Justin Martyr's* time those that were in the Countrey, and those that were in the City, when those were no more than made one Congregation, met together in one place, πάντων κατὰ πόλεις καὶ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνελεύσεις, the Meeting consisted of such as lived at a good distance, but none will imagine it to be a *Diocesan* Church, but those who will have a single Congregation to be such a Church. *All the Christians in City and Countrey*, says Dr. *Downham*, *if they had been assembled together, would have made but a small Congregation.* w.

w *Defence l.2. c.4.p.69.*

Our *Authour* would prove the largeness of *Basil's* Diocess by the distance between *Cæsarea and Sasima.* *. He makes much of it and takes the pains to measure the distance between these Towns, or rather, as he says, to *make some guess at it out* of an *Itenerary* and *Putinger's Tables*; yet tells us the distance must be as great at least as between *Hippo* and *Fussala*, that so *St. Basil's* Diocess may be as great at least as that of *St Austin's*. I think they will prove much alike, for as I have shew'd that *Austin's* Diocess was not one foot larger for *Fussala*, so it will appear that *St. Basil's* had not the least enlargement upon the account of *Sasima*. That he might not be out in his measures nor have lost all his labour, two things

x *pag.546,547*

things ſhould firſt have been cleared, neither of which is (or I think can be proved; 1ſt, That *Saſima* was in *Baſil*'s Dioceſe, for if it was but only in his *Province*, how far ſoever it was from *Cæſarea*, his Dioceſe can be nothing the larger for it, though his Province might. To prove it in his Dioceſe I find nothing but his own aſſertion, that *Saſima is ſaid expreſly to be taken out of the Dioceſe of* Baſil; but where is this ſaid expreſly, or by whom, except by himſelf? The words in the Margin ſignify no ſuch thing, but only ſome attempt to *deprive a Metropolis of* Saſima. For a Metropolis may be deprived of a Town which is in any part of the Province, when another *Metropolitan* ſeizeth on it. And I believe our *Author* is yet more *out* in taking the *Metropolis* which *Nazianzen* ſpeaks of to be *Cæſarea*, when it appears by the *Epiſtle* to be rather *Tyana*. For as the whole Epiſtle is writ to *Baſil*, ſo theſe words cited, after many others by way of ſharp expoſtulation, are directed *to him* as endeavouring to deprive a *Metropolis* of this Town, called ironically τῶν λαμπρῶν Σασίμων: Now *Cæſarea* was not the Metropolis which *Baſil* would have deprived of *Saſima*, he earneſtly endeavoured to have it annext thereto; but he would have deprived *Tyana* of it, if *Anthimus* the Metropolitan there, had not made a ſtout oppoſition. 2dly, He ſhould have proved, that after this part of *Cappadocia* was divided into *two* Provinces, *Saſima* was in that Province which fell to *Baſil*'s ſhare (for if it was not in his Province how could his Dioceſe be any larger for it?) but inſtead of this our Author offers what may ſerve to diſprove it, telling us that in the antient *Greek Notitia*, *Saſima* is ſet down in the *ſecond* Cappadocia (which belonged to *Anthimus* as the firſt did to *Baſil*) *and ſo*, ſayes he, *it is not likely to be very near* Cæſarea. No indeed, it is thereby proved to be ſo far from *Cæſarea*, that it did

not

not enlarge *Basil's* Province, much less his Diocese. Thus it is also placed in the Διατυπωσις of *Leo Sophus* under the Metropolitan of *Tyana*, not of *Cæsarea*. It is true *Basil* laid claim to it, but after some contest he yeilded, and *Anthimus* carried it, placing *Eulalius* there as one of his Suffragans, when *Nazianzen* had quitted it.

He goes farther on to shew the largeness of Dioceses in *Basil's* Province.

"It is plain by *Nazianzen* that *Cappadocia* had but "50 Bishops, for so many he sayes *Basil* had under him, "and considering the extent of that Countrey the Dio- "ceses must needs be large.

He does not say *Basil* had no more under him, nor that he was making no more; he knew *Basil* was constituting more Bishops in that part of *Cappadocia* which was his Province, and *Nazianzen* commends him for it as an excellent undertaking on several accounts *y*.

y *Orat. de Bas.*

"Considering the extent of that Countrey, the Dio- "ceses must needs be large, for the Countrey as *Strabo* "computes, is near 400 miles in length, and little less in "breadth.

If he means *Basil's* own Province, where he told us there were 50 Suffragans under him besides *Sasima*, &c *z*: (as I know not what he can mean else, if his Discourse be not impertinent and inconsistent; for *Basil* as Metropolitan had no Bishops under him, but those in his proper Province) *Strabo* is strangely misrepresented to serve a turn; for it is the *whole Countrey* which passed under the name of *Cappadocia*, that the *Geographer* gives us the dimensions of in the place cited, and tell us it was divided *into ten Prefectures*, *Meletena*, *Cataonia*, *Cilica*, *Tyanitis*, *Isauritis*, &c. whereof *Basil's* Province was but one, *viz.* that called *Cilica*, and that of *Anthimus*, *Tyanitis*, another, *&c. Mazaca*

z *Pag.* 546.

(afterwards

(afterwards called *Cæsarea*) being Metropolis of *Basil's* and *Tyana* of *Tyanitis*, &c. and after he hath given some account of these *ten Præfectures*, he adds the dimensions of the whole Countrey, in these words, *the extent of* Cappadocia *in breadth from the* Euxine *to* Taurus, *is* 1800 *Furlongs*, *in length* 3000. So that our *Author* will have the extent of *Basil's* Province to be no less than that of the *whole Countrey*, when it is but the *tenth part* thereof. And as if this were not enough, he makes the breadth of the whole Countrey, to be near twice as much as it is in *Strabo*; but he hath some salvo for this, such as it is.

"And little less in breadth, as *Causabon* restores the "reading of 1800 Furlongs in the 12th. *Book*, by "a passage in the *second* where the breadth is made "2800.

It is true *Causabon* observes some difference in the places cited, but he shews how they may be easily reconciled, without changing the Text here, or making the Countrey broader than it is here described, *viz.* by taking *Pontus* in one place for the *Sea*, in the other for the *Region* so called, separated from *Cappadocia by mountains parallel to* Taurus; and then concludes, *Sic non erit discedendum à vulgatâ lectione.* So that he hath no relief by *Causabon* without curtailing the Passage.

"And in this compass Bishops may contrive 50 Dio-"ceses of very competent extent, and not inferiour to "many of ours.

Let him try how in *Basil's* Province of about 40 miles in length, he can *contrive* room for above 50 Bishops, with as large Dioceses as those he pleads for. That which is now thought little enough for *one* Bishop *Basil* conceived too big for *Fifty*.

What

What Dioceſes *Baſil* (and others before him) thought ſufficient for Biſhops both then, and in former times, appears by a paſſage which our *Author* next cites, where *Amphilochius Biſhop of Iconium, is directed to conſtitute Biſhops for the Province of Iconium, in little Corporations and Villages.* *a* Hundreds of inſtances might be brought of Biſhops elſewhere, in *ſuch little places and Villages*, but I will go no further now, than the inſtance himſelf offers us, whereby it is manifeſt that a *little Corporation, or a Village* might furniſh a Biſhop with ſuch a Dioceſe, as was then thought competent, both by *Baſil*, and the Church *before him.* For in ſuch *little places* there was Biſhops before, as *Baſil* there ſignifies, and he gives direction that it ſhould be ſo ſtill. Yet he, that would adviſe the reducing of Biſhops to ſuch *Sees* now, would be counted an enemy to Epiſcopacy; and his advice deſtructive to Biſhops. So much do we now differ, both from the judgment and practice of the antient Church, and the moſt eminent Biſhops in it.

a Ep. 406.

Hereby alſo it appears that the *multiplying of Metropolitans* was no ſuch occaſion of *multiplying Biſhops*, but that their numbers *increaſed*, when there was not that occaſion; And this in *Cappadocia*, which is our *Author's* eminent inſtance. *b* For Biſhops were multiplyed by erecting Epiſcopal Sees in *Villages, and little places*, this was done in *Iſauria*, a Province in *Cappadocia*, as appears by theſe paſſages in *Baſil*, before the conteſt between him and *Anthimus*, upon the conſtituting of a new Metropolitan: and after that difference was Compoſed, *Baſil* thought it adviſeable that it ſhould be done ſtill. And the like may be ſaid of *Africa*, the inſtance he moſt inſiſts on, and ſpends many Pages upon it, pretending the occaſion why *Biſhops* were ſo numerous there, was the *Schiſm* of the *Donatiſts*,

b Pag. 545.

Whereas the rule by which the *African Fathers* proceeded in erecting Biſhopricks in *little places*, and ſo increaſing the number of Biſhops, was as themſelves declare, who beſt knew it, *the increaſe of the number of Chriſtians*: c Where theſe were multiplyed, and deſired a Biſhop, they thought themſelves obliged to let them have one; not excepting the meanneſs or ſmalneſs of the places, where he was to be conſtituted. And we muſt believe (if we have any reverence for thoſe Fathers) that they would have done, what they judged themſelves obliged to, though there had been no *Donatiſts* amongſt them. And when there can be no ſuch pretence of occaſion from the *Donatiſts*, the practice was continued, as appears by *St. Auſtin*'s procuring a Biſhop for *Fuſſala*, which he calls a *Caſtle*, upon ſome increaſe of the *Catholicks* there, diverſe years after the noted *conference* at *Carthage*, where the heart of the *Donatiſts* was broken; Nay, many years after the invaſion of the *Vandals*, and the death of *St. Auſtin* they proceeded in the ſame methods, or rather exceeded their Predeceſſors in multiplying Biſhops, by erecting Epiſcopal ſeats in ſmaller, and more inconſiderable places, if *Leo* his Epiſtle may be credited. d

c Concil. Carth. 2 Can. 5.

d Ep. 85.

But to return to our *Author*, and the paſſage of *Baſil*, inſiſted on, by which ſayes he, 'it appears that 'Iſauria was part of *Baſil's* Province; How this appears by any thing therein, I cannot imagine, our *Author* ſignifies before that *Iſauria* was a diſtinct *Province*, the Metropolis of it (as he ſuppoſes) *Seleucia*, which had a metropolitan and ſuffragans before, and being now deſtitute, the Biſhops in the Vicinity were careful to provide others. Which being ſo, that it ſhould be part of *Baſil's* Province ſeems as incongruous, as if it were ſaid, that the Province of *York*, is part of the Province of *Canterbury*: but if this could be digeſted,

that

that one Province is part of another, yet *Isauria* would rather be part of *Amphilochius* his province, who (as he tells us) was to *constitute* a Metropolitan and other Bishops therein, than of *Basil's*, who is only represented as giving *advice* about it. Or if giving *advice* and direction, would prove any thing of this nature, the *Papists* might think it a good argument, that *Africa* was part of the *Roman Province*, because *Leo* Bishop of *Rome* gives advise, how Bishops should be there constituted. *e*

e *Ibid.*

Next he brings in the *Chore-piscopi* in order to his design, and tells us *f* they were 'Countrey *Bishops*, and 'their Church consisted of *many* Congregations, and 'those at a good distance one from another, and also 'that some of them had the inspection of a large Ter-'ritory, no less it is like than the County of *Fussala*.

f *Pag.* 550.

But not a word for proof of this, save *Basil's* mentioning a Chor-episcopus τῶν τόπων *of some places*; Whereas if he had been the Bishop of two or three Villages, this might be enough to satisfie the import of that expression. Yet he knows there is some one Countrey Parish, that hath ten times as many, or more Villages in it, but never pretended to be a *Dioceſan Church*, and that such a pretence would be now counted ridiculous.

He adds, that which, if it were true, wouldgo near to *dethrone* these *Countrey Bishops*; (for *Basil* speaks of them, as having their *Thrones* in Villages) and render them less than antient Presbyters, for all their *large Territory*, and there being *Dioceſans*.

'But yet these were but the *Deputies* or *Surrogates* of 'the City Bishops in point of jurisdiction, for they 'were to do nothing of moment without their Bishop.

had

If this be ſo, it would be leſs wonder that the *Pope* will have Biſhops to be but his ſubſtitutes; and that ſome Biſhops will have the Paſtors of Parochial Churches to be but their *Vicars* or *Curates*. I hope our *Author* intends better, however it is well that ſuch odd *Hypotheſes* have no better ſupport than that which is added, for ſayes he, *they were to do nothing of moment without their Biſhop*; this is his argument, and he is not alone in urging it. Let us ſee whether it will not do the Biſhops (for whoſe advancement it is deſigned) as much diſſervice, as it can do the Chorepiſcopi, or Presbyters; diveſting them of that which is counted more neceſſary and advantagious to them, than a large Dioceſe. The Provincial Biſhops were obliged to do nothing, μηδὲν πρᾶξαι ἄνευ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, *without the Biſhop of the Metropolis*, this the ſynod at *Antioch* decrees, *according to an antient Canon of the Fathers*. *g* By this argument we muſt conclude, that the Biſhops in a Province were but the *Deputies* and *Surrogates* of the Metropolitan. And it may proceed proportionably againſt the *Metropolitans* with reſpect to the ἔξαρχοι or *Primates*; and alſo to *their* prejudice in reference to the *Patriarchs*. It will go near to deſtroy the *Biſhops* likewiſe, if we follow it downwards. In the antient Church *the Biſhops were to do nothing of moment, without the Presbyters*, this the moſt judicious and Learned *Aſſerters* of Epiſcopacy acknowledge; *h* Nay further, in the beſt Ages of the Church, the *Biſhops were to do nothing without the people*, that is, without their *preſence and conſent*. This is moſt evident in *Cyprian's Epiſtles*, and is acknowledged by ſuch *Prelatiſts* as are otherwiſe reſerved enough. *i* Now by this Argument we may conclude that Biſhops were but the *Deputies* or *Surrogates* of the Presbyters; or which will be counted more intolerable, that Biſhops had

g *Can.* 9. *Can. Apoſt.* 35. *Concil. Milev. Can.* 13.

h *B. Bilſon, Dr. Field, Dr. Downham, B. Hall, M. Thorndike, B. Usher.*

i *Vide defence of Dr. St.* Pag. 407.

had their jurisdiction from the people by *Deputation and Vicarage*. It may be this *Gentleman* will not like his argument so well, when he sees what improvement it is capable of, yet in pursuance of it he adds, 'Basil 'is so resolute upon his prerogative, that he will not endure they should ordain, as much as the inferiour 'Clergy, without his consent; and if they do, let 'them know, (sayes he) that whosoever is admitted 'without our consent shall be reputed but a Layman.

I suppose the *Prerogative* for which he will have *Basil* so *resolute*, is a *Negative* in ordinations upon the Countrey Bishops; but this cannot be concluded from the words cited. For the Council of *Nice* gives the Metropolitan a power, as to ordinations in the same words, *k* declaring that if a Bishop be ordained by the Provincials, χωρὶς γνώμης, *without the judgment of the Metropolitan*, the great Council will have *him accounted no Bishop*; and yet the Metropolitan had no *Negative* upon the Provincials in Ordinations, for the same *Council* determines, that in ordinations *plurality of Votes shall prevail*, which is utterly inconsistent with any ones *Negative voice*. What then is the import of *Basil's* ἄνευ γνώμης? take it in the words of a very Learned and Judicious *Dr.* of this Church, *it is indeed there said, that none should be ordained* χωρὶς γνώμης *without the opinion of the Metropolitan, but that doth not import a Negative voice in him, but that the transaction should not pass in his absence, or without his knowledge, advice and suffrage*, &c. *l*

k Can. 6.

l Barrow of the Popes Supremacy, Pag. 314.

5. It is no proof of a *Diocesan Church*, to shew that a Town, besides the Clergy or Officers in it, had some Presbyters or Congregations in the Countrey belonging to it. The instances which signifie no more, or not so much, are produced as sufficient arguments to

prove

prove there were ſuch Churches. As that of *Gaius Diddenſis Presbyter*, ſuppoſed (with what ground I examine not) to have been a Countrey Presbyter belonging to *Carthage*, and under *Cyprian*. *m* And that of *Felix* ſaid to do the Office of a Presbyter, under *Decimus* another Presbyter; a thing unheard of in thoſe times, but let us take it as we find it, and upon the very ſlender reaſon alledged againſt *Goulartius* (who is of another Judgment) believe, that he was a Prieſt in ſome Village belonging to *Caldonius* his Dioceſe. *n* And that order for the Presbyters from their Churches, *to repair to their proper Biſhop for Chriſm* in *Africa*, *o* in *Spain*, *p* and in *France*. *q* To theſe are added, for further evidences, the Churches (ſaid without ground to be *many*,) belonging to *Hippo Diæritorum*; Alſo the Church of *Thyana*, belonging to *Alypius* Biſhop of *Tageſta*, which without reaſon, we muſt take to be a conſiderable City, *r* and the City *Milevis*, becauſe *Petilian* ſayes *Tunca* belonged to it once, though now it had a Biſhop of its own; and by our Authors Art of computation, *Towns*, *Villages* and *Cities* muſt belong to *Milevis*, upon the ſole account of *Tunca*, ſometime appertaining to it, *ſ* and theſe with *Fuſſala*, (of which before) are the chief inſtances to prove that *Africa* had very large *Dioceſes not inferiour to thoſe of ours, in extent of Territory*. *t* Beſides in the Council of *Neocæſarea* *Countrey Presbyters* are diſtinguiſhed from others; *u* and that of *Antioch* provides that *Countrey Presbyters ſhall not give Canonical Epiſtles*, *w* and allows the Biſhop to *order his own Church*, and the *Countrey places depending on it*. *x* And *Epiphanius* ſpeaks of a Church belonging to his charge, which we muſt underſtand to be his *Dioceſe*, though in the paſſage cited, it is twice called his *Province*, *y* in fine, *Jerome* ſpeakes of ſome baptized by Presbyters or Deacons

m Vindication. p. 504.

n Pag. 506. 507.

o Con. 4. *Can.* 36.

p Tol. 1. *Cap.* 20.

q Vaſcon. Can. 3.

r Pag. 527.

ſ Pag. 528.

t Pag. 516.

u Can. 13.

w Can. 8.

x Can. 9. *Pag.* 536.

y Pag. 555.

cons in *Hamlets, Caſtles,* and *Places remote from the Biſhop.*

Theſe and ſuch like are uſed as good arguments for *Dioceſan Churches,* whereas there are diverſe Towns in *England,* which beſides the Officers in them, have *many* Congregations and Presbyters in Villages belonging to them, and contained within the Parith; and yet our Author and thoſe of his perſwaſion would think *Dioceſans* quite ruined, if they were reduced, and confined to the meaſures of thoſe Pariſh Churches, and left no bigger than ſome of our Vicarages and Parſonages, though ſuch as Mr. *Hooker* affirms to *be as large as ſome antient Biſhopricks*; he might have ſaid *moſt*, there being not one in many greater or ſo large. I yet ſee no ground in antiquity, nor can expect to have it proved, that the larger ſort of ordinary Biſhopricks in the *fourth age*, and ſometime after, were of more extent than two ſuch Vicarages would be, if united. Yet a Biſhop of ſuch a Diſtrict in our times would be counted ſo far from having a *competent Dioceſe*, that he would ſcarce eſcape from being ſcorned as an *Italian Epiſcopellus.*

But his greateſt argument, (in compariſon of which his other Allegations, he tells us, are but *accidental hints*, z.) which he moſt inſiſts on, and offers many times over; ſo that it makes a great part of his diſcourſe on this ſubject. *a* It is drawn from the *number of Biſhops in Councils*, by which he would evince the *largeneſs* of antient *Dioceſes*, when it no way proves *Dioceſan* Churches of any ſize. He proceeds upon this ſuppoſition that *there were great numbers of Chriſtians in all parts and Cities, b in the firſt age: And that the Biſhops were fewer in former times than afterwards.* The former part of his *Hypotheſis*, if he underſtands the numbers of Chriſtians to be any thing comparable to what they

z *Pag.* 508.

a *Pag.* 508. *to Pag.* 555. *to* 539. *Pag.* 556. *to* 562.

b *Pag.* 530.

they were after *Constantine*, when Bishops were much multiplied; (as he must understand it, if he expect any service from it) wants proof, and he offers none but some passages in *Tertullian*, strained far beyond what is agreeable to other *antient Authors*, of which before. Let me add that *Nazianzen* comparing the numbers of Christians in former times, with those in *Julian's* Reign, says, they were *not many* in former Persecutions, (Christianity had not reached many, οὔπω ἐπὶ πόλλους) no, not in that of *Dioclesian*, &c. (though they were at that time, farr more numerous, than in *Tertullian's* age) but
c Orat. 3. that Christianity was found only in a few ἐν ὀλίγοις c. The *other part* which needs no proof, since it is granted, (and may be without any advantage to him) he attempts to prove largely and industriously; but by such a *medium* as makes that which is granted to be questionable, such a one which as it is ordered may conclude backward, and prove the contrary to what he designs. That this may be manifest, let it be observed, that he will have us take an account of the number of Bishops in the Church by their appearing in *Councils*, more or fewer; and accordingly judge in several periods, whether they were less numerous, and consequently their Dioceses larger in former times than afterwards. And to this purpose we need view no other instances than himself produces. At *Lambese* in *Africa* there were 90 Bishops against *Privatus*; but not so many in any Council after (though not a few are mentioned in that
d pag. 509. Countrey) till the *Donatists* grew numerous *d*. In *Spain* the Council of *Eliberis* had 19 Bishops in the beginning of the 4th. Age, and the first Council of *Toledo* had no more in the beginning of the age after. But the following Synods, at *Saragossa*, *Gerunda*, *Ilerda*,
e pag. 557. 558 *Valentia*, *Arragon*, had not so many *e*. In *France* the Council at *Valence* had 21 Bishops in the fourth Age, but

but thoſe following them, in that and the after ages had ſtill fewer, *viz.* That of *Riez*, *Orange*, the third of *Arles*, that at *Angers*, that at *Tours*, and *Vennes* and another at *Arles*. For *General* Councils, the firſt at *Nice* had 318 Biſhops in the beginning of the fourth Age, that at *Epheſus* above an hundred years after, had but two hundred, that at *C. P.* in the latter end of the fourth Age had but one hundred and fifty Biſhops.

So that if we take account how many Biſhops there were of old, as he would have us, by *their numbers in Councils*, there will be more before the middle of the third Age, than in the beginning of the fourth; more in the beginning of the fourth than in ſome part of the fifth; and more in the beginning of the fifth, than in ſome part of the ſixth; quite contrary to the *Hypotheſis* on which he proceeds. Whether by his argument he would lead us to think *Dioceſes* did wax and wane ſo odly, as it makes Biſhops to be more or fewer, I cannot tell. However ſince he grants that in the fourth and fifth Ages *Dioceſes* were *very ſmall f*, and *crumbled into* f *pag.* 552.
ſmall pieces g, (and ſo nothing like ours): there's no g *pag.* 516.
expectation he can find any larger, if any thing near ſo great, in any former age: unleſs they can be larger when incomparably fewer Chriſtians belonged to theſe Biſhops; which will be no leſs a paradox than the former. For it cannot but be thought ſtrange, that the Biſhops Dioceſe ſhould be *greater* when his flock was undeniably far *leſs*. And they ſeem not to be *Chriſtian Biſhopricks*, whoſe meaſures muſt be taken by numbers of *Acres* rather than of *Souls*; or by multitudes of Heathens rather than Chriſtians.

He denies not, that *the generality of Biſhops, for a long while after the Apoſtles*, had *but one Congregation to Go-* *Pag.* 71.
vern. What then? ſays he, *If all the Believers in and*

about a City would hardly make a Congregation, that is to be ascribed to the condition of those times. Dioceſes with him, were largeſt in the firſt times; but Biſhops being ſtill multiplyed, they became leſs and leſs, and ſo were very ſmall and crumbled into very little pieces in the fourth and fifth Ages. This is the tendency of his diſcourſe all along. Thus Dioceſes muſt be largeſt, when a Biſhop had but one Congregation; but in after ages when he had more Congregations under his inſpection Dioceſes were very ſmall. If he will ſtand to this, our differences may be eaſily compromized. Let him and thoſe of his perſwaſion, be content with the Dioceſes in the firſt ages, when he counts them largeſt; and we ſhall never trouble any to reduce them to the meaſures of the fourth and fifth ages, when in his account they were ſo lamentably *little*, and *crumbled ſo very ſmall*.

The particulars premiſed contain enough to ſatisfie *all*, that I have yet ſeen alledged out of Antiquity for *Dioceſan Churches*, ſo that no more is needful, yet let me add another, which will ſhew there is a *medium* between *Congregational* and *Dioceſan* Churches. So that if ſome Churches ſhould be ſhewed out of the *Antients* exceeding the *Congregational meaſures* (as ſome there were in the times of the four firſt General Councils) yet it cannot thence be immediately inferred that they were *Dioceſan*, ſince they may prove a *third* ſort of Churches, and ſuch as will as little pleaſe thoſe of this Gentleman's perſwaſion as *Congregational*.

6. It's no argument for a *Dioceſan* Church, that there were ſeveral fixed Churches, with their proper Presbyters in a City or its Territory; ſo long as theſe Churches, how many ſoever were *governed in common* by the Biſhop and Presbyters in ſuch a Precinct. For though few inſtances can be given of ſuch Churches in or be-

belonging to a City in the 4th. Age; yet wherever they were extant in that, or the following Age, in things of *common concern* to those Churches, they were ordered in common by a Presbytery, that is, the Bishop with the Presbyters of that Precinct. *Jerome* declares it *de jure*, *they ought to be governed in common*, *in communi debere Ecclesiam regere.* *h*

h In Titus 1.

And *Felix* 3 Bishop of *Rome*, (than whom no Bishop was higher, or more absolute in those times,) declares it *de facto*, when he speaks of the Presbyters of that Church, as συνόδιον μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον, *ruling that Church with him.* It is the same word that the governing of Churches by other Bishops, is expressed by μέχρι νῦν ἔκαστον τῶν τὰς πόλεις ἐκείνας ἐκκλησιας ἔχοντων, as *Alexander* saith of *Narcissus*, ἐπὶ ἐμοῦ νῦν τὸν τόπον ἐπιτροπεύει, *i* It imports no less than *praesidere*, and is ascribed to Bishops and Presbyters, jointly by *Tertullian*, *k* *Cyprian* *l* and *Firmilian*. *m* Hence the Presbyters are frequently said to be συλλειτουργοὶ with the Bishop, *n* for then the Governing power of Bishops was but counted a *Ministry*, λειτουργίαν γὰρ εἰς τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔργον ἐπίστευσεν, *o* and the Presbyters *fellow Ministers* with him, and joint Administrators in the Government. They are styled συμποιμένες, *p* *fellow Pastors*, they did not then dream that a Bishop was *sole Pastor* of many Churches. They are also called συνέδρια, which is no less than συνθρόνοι, *q* for the Presbyters had their *Thrones* with the Bishop. So *Nazianzen* speaks of *Basil* when ordained Presbyter, as promoted ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς θρόνους *to the Sacred Thrones of the Presbyters.* *r* They are also called συνεδρεῖον or πάτρωνοι τῆς ἱερᾶς. *s*

i Euseb. l. 6. c. 11.
k Apol. c. 39.
l Lib. 1. Ep. 3.
m Ep. 75.
n Theod. Hist. l. 4. c. 8. Epiphan. Her. 42.
o Isidor Lib. 4. Ep. 260.
p Naz. Orat. 1. Orat. 7.
q Ignat. ad Trall. in Chrysost. Tom. 7. Hom. 2. a.
r Orat. 20.
s Chrys. in Tim. Hom. 1.

But further evidence is needless, though abundance may be produced, since the great *Patrons* of Episco-

pacy seems not to question it, that the *Church was governed in common*, and the Bishop was to do nothing of importance without the Presbyters, it is acknowledged by Bishop *Bilson*, t Bishop *Downham*, u Bishop *Hall* asserts it, as *that which is Universally accorded by all antiquity, that all things in the antient Church were ordered and transacted by the general consent of Presbyters.* w Mr. *Thorndike* proves at large, *that the Government of Churches passed in common*; x Primate *Usher* more succinctly but effectually. y Add but Dr. *St.* who both asserts and proves it, z *there was still one Ecclesiastical Senate, which ruled all the several Congregations of those Cities in common, of which the several Presbyters of the Congregations were Members, and in which the Bishop acted as the President of the Senate, for the better Governing the affairs of the Church*, &c.

t *Perpet Govern. Cap.* 11.
u *Defence. lib.* 3. *L.* 1. *c.* 8.
w *Hyp.* P. 47.
x *Prim. Govern.*
y *Reduct. of Episcopacy.*
z *Iren. Pag.* 354. 355. 356.

Let me add, when the Churches were so multiplyed in City and Territory, as that it was requisite to divide them into Parishes, and constitute several Churches; the Bishop was not the *proper Ruler* or *Pastor* of the whole Precinct, and the Churches in it, or of any Church, but *one*. The Parishes or Churches were divided among Presbyters and Bishop, they had their several distinct cures and charges; the Bishops peculiar charge was the *Ecclesia principalis*, the chief Parish or Church so called, or ἐνδυτικὴ καθέδρα. The Presbyters performed all Offices in their several *Cures*, and ordered all affairs which did particularly concern the Churches where they were incumbents; those that were of more common concern were ordered by Bishop and Presbyters together, and thus it was in the Bishops Church or Parish, he performed all Offices, administred all Ordinances of Worship himself, or by Presbyters joyned with him, as Assistants. He was to attend this *particular cure* constantly, he was not allowed to be absent

sent, no, not under pretence of taking care for some other Church; if he had any business there which particularly concerned him, he was to make quick dispatch, and not (χρονίζων ἐν ἀμελείᾳ τῆς ἰδίας λαοῦ, as *Zonaras*) *stay there with the neglect of his proper flock*; this is all evident by a Canon of the Council of *Carthage a*, *Rursum placuit ut nemini sit facultas, relicta principali Cathedra, ad aliquam Ecclesiam in Dioceſi constitutam se conferre, vel in re propria, diutius quam oportet constitutum, curam vel frequentationem propriæ Cathedræ negligere.* Of this Church or Parish he was the proper Pastor or Ruler, called there ἰδίου δήμου, and elsewhere *b* ἰδίας πόλεως, in contradistinction to other parts of the Precinct, called here Dioceses; and the people of it are called ἰδίου λαοῦ by the ancient *Canonist c*, his *proper flock or people*, his own special charge. This was the particular Church under his personal Government, but he was not Ruler of the Precinct, or any other Churches in it, save only in *common*, and in conjunction with the other Presbyters; who jointly took cognizance of what in his Church or theirs, was of greater or more general consequence, and concerned the whole, and gave order in it by *common consent*.

a In Zona. N. 77 in Cod 71.

b Can. 53.

c Zona. in loc.

And while this was the *form of Government*, if there had been as many Churches there, thus associated, as *Optatus* in the fourth age says there was at *Rome*, or far more, they could not make a *Diocesan* Church, unless a *Diocesan* and a *Presbyterian* Church be all one. For this is plainly a *Presbyterian* Church, the *antient Presbyteries* differing from the *modern* but in a matter of smaller moment. In those their *President* being *fixed* and constant, in these commonly though not always *circular*. The Presbyteries in *Scotland* comprized some twelve, some twenty, some more Churches, their

their *Moderators* were at first, and for some years, *circular*, King *James* afterwards, *Anno* 1606 *d*, would have them to be *constant*, and so it was ordered; yet when they were *fixed*, no man ever counted these *Presbyteries* to be *Diocesan* Churches. The Church of *Geneva* consists of twenty four Parishes, governed in common by a Presbytery with a Moderator, who is sometimes changed, sometimes continued for Life. *Calvin* was *President* while he lived, yet that of *Geneva* is not wont to be taken for a *Diocesan* Church. Nor were those antient Churches such, while they were *governed*, not by *one* Bishop, but by a *Senate* of Presbyters where he *presided*; as in the Council of *Constantinople* all things *in the Province* are said, *to be governed*, not by the *Metropolitan*, but *by the Provincial Synod*.

d Bish. p. 559.

e Can. 2. Soc. l. 5. cap. 8.

Finally, the Presbyters are in the antient Church acknowledged to have had the *power of the keys*, both as to the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, and *the exercise of Government and censures*. This power they exercised either jointly in conjunction with the Bishop and Senate of Presbyters; or *distinctly* in the particular Churches whereof they had the charge. The *former* power concerning the Word and Sacraments is not questioned, nor is there any ground to question, the *latter*, if some were not swayed more by the practice of their own times, than the principles and declarations of the antients. *Chrysostom* ascribes to Presbyters, not only ἱερωσύνην, the power of order, but οἰκονομίαν the power of Government *f*, giving this as the reason why the Apostle gives the same rules for the ordering both of Bishops and Presbyters, *there is but little difference betwixt them*, says he, *for they are ordained both to the teach-*

f In 1 Tim. Hom. 11.

teaching (προστασίαν) *and ruling of the Church* Now that προστασία, denotes jurisdiction or *presidentiam cum potestate*, and is as *Hesychius* renders it, κυβέρνησις, is plain in *Chrysostome* himself; he tells us the Apostle *Paul* had τὴν οἰκουμένην προστασίαν, *g* which he elsewhere expresses by τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν κυβέρνων *h*: and speaking of *Moses*, he says, *it was wonderful, that he who was to be a Ruler*, ὁ προστάτης μέλλων ἔσεσθαι, *should be born at such a time* i. *Theophilact* makes the difference as little between Bishop and Presbyters, and ascribes as much power to the later, almost in the same words *k*. So *Theodoret* declares προστασίαν, jurisdiction to belong to every Presbyter *l*, *against an Elder especially, no less than two Witnesses must be admitted, because he having* ἐκκλησίας προστασίαν, *the Government of the Church, and in the exercise of it often grieving Delinquents, they being ill affected to him, will be apt to bring false accusations.* And this is the ἡγεμονία included in the Presbyters Office, οὔτε λειτουργίαν χρὴ λέγειν, οὔτε ἡγεμονίαν as *Nazianzen* speaks and much more to that purpose *m*. And besides many other passages of like import, the Title of Governours is all a long in antient Writers given to Presbyters; and all the expressions which signifie Authority and Government, are ascribed to them. Thereby those that would curtail their power, and make it no more of old than it is now, are not a little encumbred; to extricate themselves a distinction is devised of a power *internal* and *external*, the former they will allow to Presbyters in their respective Churches, not the later.

But this is devised to disentangle themselves, and salve the deviations and irregularities of later times, not that there is any ground for it in Antiquity. For the highest act of that *external* power of jurisdiction, is *Excommunication*; and if this was in the Presbyters power of old, no other act of that power will, or can in

g *In 1 Cor. Hom. 23. & Hom. 25.*
h *In 2 Cor. Hom. 25.*
i *In Act. Hom. 16.*
k *In 1 Tim.*
l *In 1 Tim. 5. 19.*
m *Orat. 1.*

in reason be denied them; but this the antients ascribe to them; So *Jerome*, n *Mihi ante Presbyterum sedere non licet, illi si pectavero licet me tradere Satanæ ad interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit.* *Chrysostome* threatned some of his Auditory, while he was a Presbyter, to Excommunicate them, ἀπαγορεύω λοιπὸν ὑμῖν τῶν ἱερῶν τούτων ἅπτεσθαι ἀγγείων, o to wave all of like nature insisted on by others; *Justinian* in the 6th. Age signifies plainly, that not only *Bishops*, but *Presbyters* might Excommunicate Offenders, in his *Constitutions* he forbids Bishops and *Presbyters to exclude any from Communion, till such cause was declared, for which the Canons appointed it to be done*, πάντῃ τοῖς ὁσιωτάτοις ἡμῶν πρεσβυτέροις ἀπαγορεύομεν, ἀφορίζειν τινὰ ἢ ἐκβάλλειν κοινωνίας, &c. and will have the sentence of *Excommunication rescinded, which was passed by Bishops or Presbyters without cause.* p In the *Code* both Bishops and Clergy are forbid to Excommunicate in certain cases, and then mentions the cases for which they must not, ἃ ἀφορίζειν ἢ ἀποβάλλειν — καὶ τῶν τοῦτο ποιούντων ἀκούειν, *although they had been accustomed to it.* q

n *Ad Heliodorum.*

o *Hom. 17. in Matth.*

p *Novel. 123. c. 11.*

q *Lib. 39, Tit. 2. Tit. de Episc: & Clericis.*

Now while Presbyters had *this power* there could be no *Diocesan Churches*, whether they exercised it in *common*, as was shewed before, or *particularly* in their several Churches, as will now be made apparent; For by virtue of these powers the Presbyters were really Bishops, though they had not alwayes the Title, yea, they are called Bishops, as a *Learned Prelatist* observes, by the antientest Authors, *Clemens*, *Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, r and have frequently the *Names* and *Titles* which some would appropriate to Bishops, and which the Fathers use to express the Office of Bishops by, ἡγούμενοι *Præpositi*, *Antistites*, *Præsidentes*, ſ &c. And so there was as many Bishops really in every Diocese, as there were particular Churches and Presbyters there; And well

r *Thornd. Prim. Govern. Pag. 73. 74.*

ſ *Idem. servicc. Pag. 68.*

may

may they be said to be really the same, since they were of the very *same Office*; for Bishops in the antient Church, were not a *superiour Order* to Presbyters, but had only a Precedency in the same *Order*. This some of the most judicious and learned *Defenders* of Episcopacy assert. And those who hold that *Patriarchs*, *Metropolitans* and *Bishops* differed not in *Order*, but in *degree* only, which is the common opinion of *Episcopal Divines*, and yet contend that Bishops and Presbyters were of a *different order*, will never be able to prove it. The difference they assign between *Bishops* and *Metropolitans* is, that these *presided in Synods, and had a principal interest in Ordinations*, and what more did the preeminence of antient Bishops, distinguishing them from Presbyters amount to? It consisted in nothing material but their *presidency* in Presbyteries, and their power in Ordinations. This last is most insisted on, as making the difference wider, between these than the other. But with little reason all things considered. For those to be ordained, were first to be examined and approved by the Presbyters, μὴ ἄλλως χειροτονείσθωσαν ἀλλὰ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων κληρικῶν δοκιμαζόντων *t*, the ordaining of one to the Presbytery was to be ψηφῷ καὶ κρίσει τοῦ κλήρου πάντων *u*. It was a crime for which the greatest Bishop in the World was censurable, to preferr any, or make Ordinations παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ κλήρου, as appears by what *Chrysostome* was accused of, though it is like falsly *w*, and this is counted by some the *substance* of Ordination, wherein the Presbyters had no less share (to say no more) than the Bishop. And in *imposing hands*, which was the *Rite of Ordaining*, the Presbyters were to concurr with the Bishop, for which there is better Authority than the Canon of an *African* Council, for saith a very learned *Doctor x, to this purpose, the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery* y, *is no ways impertinently alledged, although*

t *Theophilus Commonitor. cap. 6.*

u *Clem. Constitut. lib. 8. cap. 18.*

w *Phot. in Chry. Tom. 8. pag. 15. Concil. Carth. cap. 22. Turon.*

x *Iren. p. 27*

y 1 *Tim.* 1. 1

me, suppose St. Paul to concurr in the action; because if the Presbytery had nothing to do in the Ordination, to what purpose were their hands laid upon him? Was it only to be Witnesses of the fact, or to signifie their consent? Both these might have been, done without their use of that Ceremony, which will scarce be instanced in, to be done by any but such, as had power to conferr what was signifyed by that Ceremony. And diverse instances are brought by the *same hand* to shew that Ordinations by Presbyters was *valid* in the antient Church z.

z pag. 379.

But if the Presbyters had been quite excluded from *Ordination*, and this power had been intirely reserved to the Bishops, yet this would not be sufficient to constitute them a *superiour Order*. For the Rite of Ordaining was so farr from being an act of *Government* or jurisdiction, that it did not inferre any *superiority* in the Ordainer; nothing being more ordinary in the practice of the Antient Church, than for those were of a *lower Degree* and Station, to Ordain their Superiours.

While there was no more distance betwixt Bishop and Presbyters but only in *Degree*, so that as the Bishop was but *primus* Presbyter, (as *Hilary* under the name of *Ambrose*, and others *a*; or *Primicerius* as *Optatus*, defined by a Learned Civilian to be πρῶτος ἐν πρεσβυτέροις) *b* the *first Presbyter*, so the Presbyter was a second Bishop ἐν δευτέρῳ τόπῳ, as *Nazianzen*. As the *Bishop* was *summus sacerdos*, in the style of *Tertullian* and others, that is, *cheif Presbyter*, so the Presbyter was *Bishop* a *degree* lower; not that he had less *pastoral power*, but because he wanted that *degree* of dignity or preeminence, for which the other was styled *chief*. As the *Prætor Urbanus* was called *Maximus*, yet he had

a In 1 Tim. Author. Quæst. in V. & N. T.

b Gothofrid. in Codic.

had no more *Power* than the other, *Prætorum idem erat collegium, eadem poteſtas* c, but only ſome more privi- c Bodin. lib. 3.
ledge and dignity, *dignitate cæteros anteibat propterea* c. 6.
maximus dicebatur d, and the ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος, at *Athens* d Feſt. in verb.
was *Prætor maximus*, yet all the reſt were *pares poteſta-* major.
et e; *Biſhops* and Presbyters had *idem miniſterium* as e Ibid.
Jerome, *eadem Ordinatio*, as *Hilary* f, they were of the f In 1 Tim. 3.
ſame *Order* and Office, had the ſame power, *the power of the Keys*, all that which the *Scripture* makes eſſential to a *Biſhop*. While it was thus, there could be no *Dioceſan Churches*, that is, no Churches conſiſting of many Congregations which had but *one Biſhop* only.

POST-SCRIPT.

A Late Writer presumes he has detected a notable mistake in the *Author*, of *No Evidence for Dioceſan Churches* (aſcribed to one who owns it not) about μύριοι, which I suppose he would have Tranſlated *Ten Thouſands definitely*; but there it is rendred *indefinitely thouſands*, as we are wont to expreſs a great many, when the preciſe number is not known. Thoſe who underſtand the Language, and have obſerved the *uſe* of the Word, will be farr from counting this a fault: and thoſe who view the paſſage will count it intolerable, to render it as that Gentleman would have it. That of *Atticus* Biſhop of *C. P.* may ſatisfie any concerning the import and uſe of the word, who ſending money for the releif of the poor at *Nice* to *Callidpius*, he thus writes,

writes, ὄμαθον μυρίους ἐν τῇ πόλει πεινῶντας δεῖσθαι τῆς τοῦ σίτου βοήθειαν ἐλέω. Μυρίους δὲ λέγω τὸ πλῆθος, οὐ τὸ ἀκριβῆ δηλῶν ἀριθμόν, where he tells him that by μυρίους he understands a multitude whose number he did not exactly know, thus (i. e. indefinitely) is the word most frequently used by Greek Writers, and particularly by *Eusebius* the Author of the passage cited. So he tells us, *Nero* killed his *Mother*, his *Brothers*, his *Wife*, σὺν ἄλλοις μυρίοις, of her Kindred: And *Timotheus* of *Gaza*, he says, indured μυρίας βασάνους. Many more might be added, where the word is not rendred by the best Translators (*Valesius* particularly) ten thousand; but still indefinitely *innumerabiles* or *infiniti*, or *sexcenti*, &c. Nor have I met with one instance (though possibly there may be some) in him where it is used to express ten thousand precisely.

Hist. l. 2. c.

l. 8. c. 13.

However it had been an unpardonable injury to *Eusebius*, to have rendred it so in this place; as if he would have deluded the World with a most palpable untruth, which both he, and all men acquainted with the state of the Church in those times, know to be so. For this make him say that ten thousand Bi-

shops

ſhops met in Councel at *Antioch* in the third Age; when as he never knew a Synod of ſix hundred Biſhops in the fourth Age, while he lived; though then Biſhops were farr more numerous, and had all encouragement to meet in greateſt numbers. This makes him ſignifie, that ten thouſand Biſhops aſſembled in the skirts of the *Eaſt part* of the *Empire*: When as their was not near ſo many (this Gentleman is concerned to maintain there was not *one thouſand*) in the *whole* Chriſtian World.

This is more than enough to ſhew that there is ſufficient warrant to Tranſlate *μύριος*, *Thouſands* more than once; though that it is in that diſcourſe (which he ſtiles *a little Pamphlet*) ſo tranſlated more then once, is another of his miſtakes. And a *third* (all in two lines) is that the Author grounds his Argument on it. Whereas thoſe that view the paſſage, and the occaſion of it, will ſee it had been more for his advantage to have tranſlated it *ten thouſands*. He that can allow himſelf to write at this rate, may eaſily be voluminous, and look too big to be deſpiſed, as a writer of *little Pamphlets*. The

Post-script.

The Letter mentioned pag. 45. *being communicated to me by* M. B. *that part of it which concerns* Alexandria *is here added, that it may appear how much it is mistaken, and how farr from being answered.*

For *Alexandria* it was the greatest City in the Empire next to *Rome*, μεγίστη μετὰ τὴν Ῥωμὴν ἡ πόλις, says *Josephus de bello Judaic lib.* 5. *c. ult.* And *Epiphanius* gives an account of many Churches in it assigned to several Presbyters, *viz.* besides *Cæsarea* finished by *Athanasius*, that of *Dionysius*, *Theonas*, *Pierius*, *Serapion*, *Perseas*, *Dizia*, *Mundidius*, *Annianus*, *Baucalas*, adding καὶ ἄλλαι. *Hæres* 69. *page* 728. This notwithstanding that the Christians at *Alexandria* which held Communion with *Athanasius*, might and did meet together in one Church, he himself declares expresly in his Apology to *Constantius*, *page* 531. *Tom.* 1. *Edit. Commelin. Anno* 1601. The whole passage is too large to transcribe or translate, this is the sence of it. He being accused for assembling the People in the great Church before it was dedicated (πρὶν αὐτὴν τελειωθῆναι) makes this part of his defence. 'The 'confluence of the People at the Paschal solemnity

'nity was so great that if they had met in seve-
'ral assemblies (κατὰ μέρος καὶ διηρημένως) the other
'Churches were so little and strait, that they
'would have been in danger of suffering by
'the crowd, nor would the universal harmo-
'ny and concurrence of the People have been
'so visible and effectual, if they had met in
'parcels. Therefore he appeals to him, whe-
'ther it was not better for the whole multi-
'tude to meet in that great Church (being a
'place large enough to receive them altogether
'ὄντος ἤδη τόπου τοῦ δυναμένου δέξασθαι πάντας, ἐν αὐτῷ συνελθεῖν,) and
'to have a concurrence of all the people with
'one voice (καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν μετὰ συμφωνίας τῶν λαῶν γίνεσθαι τὴν
'φωνήν.) For if, says he according to our Savi-
'viours promise, where two shall agree as
'touching any thing, it shall be done for them
'of my Father, &c. How prevalent will be
'the one voice of so numerous a People assem-
'bled together and saying *Amen* to God? Who
'therefore would not wonder, who would not
'count it a happiness to see so great a People
'met together in one place? And how did the
'people rejoice to behold one another, where-
'as formerly they assembled in several places?

Hereby it is evident that in the middle of the fourth Age, all the Christians at *Alexan-*

 dria,

dria which were wont at other times to meet in several assemblies, were no more than one Church might and did contain, so as they could all join at once in the Worship of God and concurre in one *Amen.*

He tells him also that *Alexander* his Predecessor,(who died *An.* 325)did as much as he in like circumstances, *viz.* assembled the whole multitude in one Church before it was dedicated, *pag.* 532.

This seems clear enough, but being capable of another kind of proof which may be no less satisfactory, let me add that also. This City was by *Strabo* his description of it, χλαμυδὸς εἰδὸς τὸ χῶμα, like a Soldiers Coat, whose length at either side was almost 30 Furlongs, its breadth at either end 7 or 8 Furlongs, *Geogr. lib.* 17. *pag.* 546. so the whole compass will be less than ten Miles. A third or fourth part of this was taken up with publick Buildings, Temples, and Royal Palaces, ἔχει τε ἡ πόλις τεμένη, τά τε κοινὰ κάλλιστα καὶ τὰ βασίλεια, τέτρατον, ἢ καὶ τρίτον τοῦ παντὸς περιβόλου μέρος. *ibid.* two Miles and half or three and a quarter is thus disposed of. I take this to be that Region of the City which *Epiphanius* calls Βρύχων, (where he tells us, was the famous Library of *Ptolomeus Philadelphus*) and speaks of

of it in his time as destitute of Inhabitants, ἔρημον τοῦ ἐκπάρχου, *de Ponder. & mensur, n. 9. p. 166* A great part of the City was assigned to the Jews, πώλεως ἀφώρισε μέρος τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ. So *Strabo* indefinitely, as *Josephus* quotes him. *Antiquit. Jud. l. 14. c. 12.* Others tells us more punctually, their share was two of the five divisions (*Ushers Annals Latin, pag.* 859.) Though many of them had their habitation in the other divisions, yet they had two fifth parts entire to themselves, and this is (I suppose) the τόπος ἔθνος which *Josephus* saith, the Successors of *Alexander* set apart for them (αὐτοῖς ἀφώρισαν, *bello Jud. l. 2. cap. 21.* Thus we see already how 6 or 7 miles of the 10 were taken up. The greatest part of the Citizens (as at *Rome* and other Cities) in the beginning of the 4th. Age were Heathens. Otherwise *Antonius* wrong'd the City, who, in *Athanasius*'s time, is brought in thus exclaiming by *Jerom. vit. Paul. p.* 243. *Væ tibi Alexandria quæ pro Deo portenta veneraris; væ tibi civitas meretrix in quam totius orbis dæmonia confluxere, &c.* a Charge thus formed, supposes the prevailing party to be guilty. But let us suppose them equal, and their proportion half of the 3 or 4 miles remaining, Let the rest be divided amongst the Orthodox, the *Arrians*, the

[illegible] and if we be [illegible] will fall to the share of Heretics and Sectaries. For not to mention others, the *Novatians* had several Churches and a Bishop there, till *Cyrils* time, *vid. Socrat. Hist. l.* 7. *c.* 7. The *Arians* were a great part of those who professed Christianity, τῶν καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ μοῖρα, (*Sozom. Hist. l.* 1. *c.* 14.) and if we may judge of the followers by their leaders, no loss than half. For whereas there were 19 Presbyters and Deacons in that Church (*Theod. Hist. l.* 4. *c.* 23.) (12 was the number of their Presbyters by their Antient Constitution, as appears by *Eutychius*, and 7 their Deacons, as at *Rome*, and elsewhere) 6 Presbyters with *Arius*, and 5 Deacons fell off from the Catholicks. *Sozom. Hist. l.* 1. *c.* 14. But let the *Arians* be much fewer, yet will not the proportion of the Catholick Bishops Diocese in this City, be more than that of a small Town, one of 8 or 12 Furlongs in compass. And so the numbers of the Christians upon this account, will be no more than might well meet for Worship in one place.

F. I. N. I. S.

404496